DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 210 24 SP 003 901

TITLE	Culture of Schools. Final Report. Volume II
INSTITUTION	American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-6-2657
PUB DATE	[70]
CONTRACT	OEC-1-6-062657-0846
NOTE	251p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Anthropology, Classroom Research, *Cross Cultural Studies, Disadvantaged Groups, *Educational Change, Educational Philosophy, *Educational Sociology, Minority Group Children, Moral Values, Puerto Rican Culture, Research Methodology, *Research Needs, *School Role, Social Change, Social Integration, Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

Volume II of this 4-volume report contains the second half of a report on the Conference on the Culture of Schools held at Greystone, New York, (the first half of the conference report appears in Vol. I, SP 003 900), and the first part of a report on the Colloquium on the Culture of Schools held at the New School for Social Research in 1966. (The second part of the New School report appears in Vol. III, SP 003 902.) Topics presented at the Greystone conference included: the differences between mass schooling and mass education; the failure of schools to socialize children of minority groups, and classroom research methodology. The second conference consisted of short, controversial papers followed by discussion. The participants discussed education in its widest social context, linking the crisis in American education to questions of societal instability. Discussion fell into four general topics: a critical view of American education; the art and science of teaching; education and social change; and the philosophy of modern education. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (RT)

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE
AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES.
MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION
ONLY.

CULTURE OF SCHOOLS

FINAL REPORT

ED039210

VOL. II

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SP003901

SOME FEATURES OF THE CRISIS IN MASS EDUCATION

12

Diamond: Introduction

In this session we will engage in a more systematic continuation of what we began yesterday morning. As you know it is on "The Nature of the Crisis in Mass Education." I have a few obvious remarks to make about that before introducing our speaker of the morning.

National universal education is, of course, a relatively new idea. Perhaps we can trace its philosophic and political origins to the Western European Enlightenment, particularly the French version of that, to the mysteries of writing and of literacy that finally emerged from the church which had previously been confined exclusively to the temple. The United States has probably been the world's major laboratory for this new experiment. The only other nation or world area which compared in size and which has undertaken a similar program from the beginning as part of a kind of constitutional notion is the Soviet Union; and many of our problems converge toward those of the Soviet Union in this particular area. The notion has been spreading rapidly throughout the world both as an idea, that is as something which is being diffused, and also because similar conditions in the modern industrial world tend to generate similar responses. So the crisis in the goals, in the means and the

SP003901

method, in the assumptions of mass education, both in this country and throughout the world share a common character. There is an educational gap which is growing within nations and among them parallel to the socio-economic gap which has been traced by the Scandanavian economist, Gunar Myrdal. Generally I think we must return to Plato's ruthless and comprehensive inquiry into this problem. In The Republic the problem is laid out in its entirety as a philosophic problem, and it is basically a philosophic problem. From Plato to John Dewey the major philosophers in our Western tradition have examined the prerequisites for the good man in the good society. Plato's solution is one that we should probably reject and yet in a curious sense without reflection we have begun to adopt it. In this spirit I am delighted to introduce Professor Thomas Green who is a philosopher in the School of Comparative Education at Syracuse University, who will discuss in some detail the nature of the crisis in mass education.

References Cited

Cohen, Yehudi A.

1964 THE TRANSITION FROM CHILDHOOD TO ADOLESCENCE. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company.

1966 "Macro-Ethnology: Large-Scale Comparative Studies," in INTRODUCTION TO CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY: ESSAYS IN THE SCOPE AND METHODS OF THE SCIENCE OF MAN, edited by James A. Clifton. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin (in press).

Young, Frank W. and Ruth C. Young

n.d. "Toward a Theory of Community Development," SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT, Vol. 7, pp. 23-38.

Thomas F. Green

It would be an indefensible egotism for anyone to suppose that within the limits of a single essay he could adequately describe the nature of the crisis in mass education. The most that can be done is to raise certain questions, formulate some problems. These remarks should therefore be viewed as adequate neither in depth nor in scope, but simply as pointing in the direction of certain studies which might have long-range implications for the health of American education.

It is essential, at the outset, to mark a distinction between education on the one hand and schooling on the other. Lawrence Cremin has pointed out that when the idea of popular education--itself as old as Plato--reached John Dewey, a subtle shift of emphasis occurred. Jefferson, he points out, "was a great believer in schooling, but it never occurred to him that schooling would be the chief educational influence on the young. Schooling might provide technical skills and basic knowledge, but it was the press and participation in politics that really educated the citizenry. Public education was to be only one part of the education of the public; and a relatively minor part at that."[1] There is no doubt that a richly diversified pattern of education was also accepted as an assumption by the generation of Horace Mann. Dewey's complaint, however, was that though all of life is educative, nonetheless, many of the agencies of

deliberate education, family, shop, union, neighborhood and the church, were no longer doing their job in industrial America. Some other agency must take on their educative functions. It became almost a folk assumption that this agency should be the school. Public schooling then tended to become coextensive with education of the public, and it has since become increasingly difficult for us to separate our understanding of education from the quite different matter of understanding schooling. Thus we should expect to find that the assumptions underlying the American emphasis on mass education would become transformed in their application so that what was a strong justification for mass education now becomes interpreted as providing a strong justification for mass schooling.

This transformation in the American understanding of mass education needs historical study. It is my own judgment that it needs historical study from within the framework of a structural-functional model of the type represented by Robert Merton or from the more comprehensive perspective of Parsonian analysis. Such a study needs to be balanced, moreover, by comparative studies of other societies and other countries which either have not been rich enough to follow the American experiment or which for some historical reasons have adopted a different way of thinking about the relation between mass education and mass schooling. Yet, to the best of my knowledge, there is but one book on the

history of American education written from the perspective of modern sociological theory. It is the rather indecisive book of Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society.

For purposes of examination I would like to lay aside the assumption that public schooling or mass schooling is in any sense coextensive with public or mass education. The fact that schooling and education have been historically distinguished is sufficient evidence that there is no logical necessity for identifying them. I wish to propose that there are certain social conditions under which the demand for mass education must be translated into a demand for mass schooling, but that there are certain other social conditions in which this relation does not hold at all. Indeed, it is my central contention that there are circumstances in which mass schooling may become dysfunctional for the purposes of education. One might assume that there is a crisis in American mass education, and from some points of viewing that seems an assumption beyond question. But what are its elements? What is its nature? By adopting this perspective, I wish to point to some of its features. My somewhat wild contention is that in contemporary American society mass schooling has become dysfunctional for the fulfillment of the ideals on which we sought to justify mass education.

Let us begin with the assertion that education is

always and everywhere the same in its main functions. Education, even deliberate education is always concerned with (1) socialization, (2) cultural transmission, and (3) the development of self-identity in the individual. These functions, of course, overlap, but I think it is well to treat them as conceptually distinct. By "socialization" I mean to focus on the structural aspects of society and the process of inducting the young into the adult roles of the society structurally defined. By "cultural transmission" I mean to emphasize the value component of society and the process of learning, adopting, and adapting the beliefs and values which provide some rationalization for the social norms and practices which the child learns. By "the development of personal identity," I mean to focus upon two fundamental but discriminable requirements of education. The first is the demand for some meaningful participational roles in a contemporary community, and the second is the necessity for a sense of identity in some historical community. I shall comment on each of these matters shortly, but first I want to turn from the idea of education to the idea of schooling.

It is a modest suggestion, and one which I think cannot be questioned, that schools, wherever they exist, should be the institutions through which a society seeks deliberately to advance the social functions of education. That is to say simply that schools should be educational institutions. That proposition seems self-evident, even

trivial. Yet it is highly suggestive; for unless we take that statement to be analytic, which it surely isn't, then it follows that in saying schools should be educational institutions we are tacitly confessing that they might not be, and the possibility that schools might not be educational institutions is precisely the possibility I wish to study.

Consider. Jefferson wrote that "if a nation expects to be free and ignorant in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never shall be." But this contention that mass education is indispensable to a democracy does not imply that mass schooling over increasingly extended periods is indispensable. In his proposal to the Virginia legislature, Jefferson urged three years of schooling to every white child of the Commonwealth and grammar school and advanced education at public expense for the bright ones. That is not much of a requirement in the way of mass schooling. A great deal of education is understood to occur outside of schools altogether, but enough will take place in school to allow for active participation in the polity and the economy. Here the function of schooling is clearly educative. This view of education for a democratic society presupposes that the process of socialization does not require very much in the way of extended schooling. Adult roles in the polity and the economy are available with a minimum of formal education in schools.

There is another set of necessities which has shaped our assumptions about mass education. The common school

undoubtedly played a large role in the process of assimilation in America. Historically, mass education was required to minimize cultural plurality. It was to produce Americans out of Irish, Italians, Germans, Swedes and all the rest. The function of the common school was clearly educative. It was to teach English, tone down the cultural differences and equip the immigrant with an historical memory which would allow him to find his identity as an American. And although this educative function was carried out in many kinds of schooling at many age levels, it was never understood to imply mass schooling over a very extended period of time. The process of assimilation was aided even in the very beginning by the fact that participation in the economy and the polity required the immigrant to shed some of his distinctive behavior in favor of what was more functional in American society.

Under both of these historical conditions the primary function of the school is education, and under neither historical set of circumstances does the idea of mass education primarily imply mass schooling. Socialization, cultural transmission and the development of self-identity may be advanced in the school, but they are primarily sustained and continued in the home, the polity and participation in the economy. Adult roles are accessible to those with common or elementary education, and identity through some vocation is possible to attain without substantial prerequisites in

the form of schooling. But now we have a new set of social conditions. We are passing from an industrial to a technological society, from a rural to an urban society, from an individualistic to a corporate, highly organized society. Now the socialization process is different. The adult social roles required in the economy and the polity are heavily loaded with technical prerequisites, and the satisfaction of those prerequisites requires extensive mass schooling. Permit me an essential distinction here. Whether the social roles defined in the vocations, the professions and in the economy generally, actually require greater and more extended schooling is a question of fact. And, like any question of fact, it can be disputed. But what cannot be disputed is that people widely <u>believe</u> that the fulfillment of these social roles requires more extended schooling. This latter fact--this certainty--is the decisive point.

In an agrarian society the idea of mass education did not imply mass schooling of an extended sort. Nor was extensive mass schooling required in the initial confrontation of the American society with its immigrant minorities. But this was so because the functions of education could be adequately met without mass schooling. In present society this is no longer true or at least is widely believed to be no longer true. Consider an example which is in many respects paradigmatic. Not long ago, Governor Rockefeller vetoed an act of the New York State legislature which would require a

college degree as a prerequisite for certification as a mortician in New York State. Had he allowed the act to become law, then access of the position of mortician in New York State would have been unavailable to anyone except through schooling. Again, it was at one time possible for a farmer, for example, to "read law" under an attorney and then through examinations, gain admission to the Bar. Abraham Lincoln did not have a law degree. That was not then the normal method of becoming an attorney. He read law as a clerk. This path for entrance into the profession is now virtually closed. "Reading law" now takes the form of schooling undertaken in pursuit of a law degree. Most law clerks, a virtually vanishing breed, must now have law degrees. Schooling is becoming an increasingly pervasive path in the process of socialization. Not even by joining the Army can one avoid the necessity for schooling as the means of gaining access to adult social roles in American society.

The point I wish to stress and reiterate is that under these conditions the actual social function of schooling becomes transformed from what was a primarily educative function to what is potentially at least a very different thing, namely, selection and certification. Both for Thomas Jefferson and the generation of Horace Mann and also in the initial stage of ethnic assimilation schooling had a primary educational purpose. Schooling was an important <u>part</u>

of the process of developing a democratic society, but it was only a part of that process, one among many alternatives. Now, however, schooling has become very nearly the sole path for entrance into adult roles. It is no longer one among many alternatives. The result is that the schools have had to assume a heavier burden of certain functions which heretofore were accomplished in other ways. Schools have had to assume a heavier share of the task of certification and selection, the self-conscious process of determining who will assume which kinds of positions in the work force and which will receive which forms of subsequent education. The schools have had to assume a primary function of certification and selection rather than education, and these two things--certification and education-are not necessarily compatible. We began with a belief in mass education as essential for the formation of a democratic society. We then learned to equate the need for mass education with a demand for mass schooling and in the process we have managed to transform the function of schooling from a primary function of education to a primary function of certification and selection.

The impact of this movement can be most easily seen in higher education where the certification function is quite properly dominant. The one thing which schools possess, especially colleges and universities, that is, the one indispensable legal power they exercise, is the power to grant degrees or diplomas. In New York State this

power is constitutionally lodged in the Board of Regents. It is a power delegated to the universities by charter. No other agency has this power. This is the respect in which colleges and universities, but also the lower schools are unique agencies. If institutions of higher education did not have this function of certification or degree-granting, then there are certain other institutional arrangements which would be unnecessary. There would be no need for grades, examinations, registrars, records, or prerequisites. It would be possible to dispense with the programmatic aspects of division into schools, divisions and departments. In short, separated from the function of certification and selection, a college or university could clearly resemble an educational institution, a teaching and research center. But certification and selection is its legal function, and it is a socially necessary one. If the colleges and universities and the lower schools did not perform this function, then some other agency would have to. The recent rise of the so-called "free universities" in America is an excellent illustration of what is at stake here. The thought behind the establishment of such schools includes the idea that education to be really effective has got to be separated from the function of certification for entrance into the adult social roles of middle-class America. The thought is that though higher education must make its contributions to socialization, that function is not incompatible with

social criticism and a cultivated and disciplined desire for change. It is not socialization as an educative goal that places a premium on the status quo; it is certification. When schools and schooling are functionally tied to certification, then they are suited to persons who aspire to high positions in the society. But, as Edgar Friedenberg has pointed out, "aspirants do not criticize, they accommodate."[3]

I stress this point not because I think there is anything particularly profound or new in the idea, but because I wish to reiterate the fact that the social function of schools is not necessarily the same as the social function of education. What we see happening in the lower schools of America is the increasingly rapid growth of the function of selection and certification. The crisis in mass education, seen from one perspective, is that the institution of the school is now set in a technological and urban society in which the task of certification and selection is increasingly paramount. This fact, as much as any other, means that the school may be becoming dysfunctional for the purposes of education. Put in another way, this would mean that the schools are becoming poor places for education at precisely that juncture in history when the society has made them virtually indispensable avenues for entrance into adult social roles. We are reluctant to entertain alternative methods of socialization and the development of personal identity not only because we are an

increasingly secular society and therefore cannot depend upon the church and other ethnic enclaves, but simply because the schools have come to own the powers of certification and selection and because we have come to view that function as indispensable to the process of socialization.

If we view my thesis as a hypothesis, then if it has any merit, we would expect it to be reflected in the concrete affairs of the school. I wish to focus on three interrelated ways in which this change of emphasis influences the conduct of the schools and shapes the school culture. First, consider how the over-emphasis on the purpose of certification influences the conduct, indeed the very conception of teaching. In the first place then we would expect the activity of teaching to become focused primarily on its results. What counts is the outcome. The consequence. The tendency then is to view teaching and to assess its excellence in terms of its product. The same would be said of the school itself. It too is to be evaluated in relation to the excellence of its product.

This perspective, in fact, permeates the entire language with which we examine the conduct of teaching. It gets to be viewed as a practical skill in "making something" or "making something happen." Indeed, there may be an almost irrestible tendency for teachers to insist on a "process-product" appraisal of their teaching in order to escape the possibility that their efforts may lack some determinable consequences.

It is comforting, perhaps even necessary, to know that one's best efforts have had some identifiable and durable results. Under the aegis of the demand for certification, teaching gets to be viewed as a productive enterprise, and the school as a productive institution. It would be important to examine the language, self-image, and self-defenses of teachers to see whether this is really true and how, if it is true, it gets related to the transforming function of the school and schooling. It would be equally important to contrast these studies with what is discoverable in other societies where the social function of schooling is different and the pervasive model of teaching is different. Do we have examples of a different view? What would one look for?

Allow me to suggest as a counter-model the view that teaching must be fun, and that it cannot be understood in the light of its outcomes. Consider an analogy. There is a jungle-gym in the yard. There it stands with its ladders and bars for climbing and its cross-pieces for swinging and jumping. The jungle-gym is an objective fact. It exists whether there are any children to play in it or not. It has its own structure to be sure, but it is essentially a thing to play with. The object is to get the child into the structure to play. Consider the so-called academic concerns of the school in this light. Language has its structure too--its logical operators, its functions and models, its peculiar metaphores. This is so even of the

"language of the street," of the shoe-shine boy and the "disadvantaged". The structure is already there. What is so often lacking in the school is the recognition that it can be played with, modified and enjoyed. This enjoyment and play becomes increasingly difficult to develop in proportion as the function of the school becomes more heavily laden with the necessity for certifying achievement in a particular standard of usage. The focus must then fall on the outcome rather than on the enjoyment of the language.

Or consider a different subject, a different jungle-gym. The study of history has its place in the socialization of the child. It is one way we attempt to shape his memory, to assist the attainment of his identity with some historical community. The end result may be to shape his membership in a community, but the immediate goal is to get him to enter the jungle-gym and play. It is to get him to enjoy using his swing as an historian. I have seen this happen in elementary schools. The result is always electrifying. The point is that learning understood in this way has its own immediate motivation and cannot be understood in relation to some remote goal. The value of teaching and of learning on this view is like the value of play. It is intrinsic to it and immediate.

This was a fundamental insight of Dewey's and is the element of truth in the idea of the play-school. The idea, of course, can be cheapened and misconstrued. The play-school

idea was seldom extended beyond the elementary school, because play was not rightly seen as having its own intrinsic discipline[4] and the academic disciplines were not seen as having their own intrinsic element of play. But the model of teaching I am describing is as applicable in higher education as it is in the elementary school. However, the fundamental point I wish to stress is that when the social function of the school becomes certification and selection, then the whole language of teaching and the behavior of teachers becomes transformed from the language and behavior of play, fun and appreciation, to the language and behavior of work, making, and producing. It would be a point of extraordinary importance to study this transformation as an aspect of the school culture.

I wish to press the point. Teaching must be fun, and the motivation for learning immediate rather than remote. But we may play a game to win or we may play it for the play. When the function of schools and schooling becomes excessively weighted with the demand for certification, then the game becomes deadly serious. It becomes a matter of what one can get out of the teacher in the end. Then the successful student must learn to take the long view and it becomes especially important for him to view the school as a kind of con-game, the object of which is not the immediate pleasure of playing on the jungle-gym, but rather to con the "system" into granting the right stamp of approval. The purpose is to

get the right "out-come," to be certified as a "proper product". It would be interesting to study the school culture for the way it rewards the con-artists, even to the point of influencing the shape and content of the curriculum. I suspect that this has a great deal to do with the differential response of students to the school who come from different social and cultural backgrounds. Some children come to the school with great skills as con-artists. Others come from backgrounds in which such behavior is not normative. This differential adaptation may have much to do with the certification monopoly of the usual elementary and secondary "establishment" as opposed to the more voluntary trade and vocational schools such as barber colleges and business schools. In the more voluntary trade schools we would expect the students to feel less strongly the "obligation" to graduate, and therefore we would expect failure to be experienced in a different way.

The second point I wish to stress is the way in which the overemphasis on the function of certification influences the ways in which children are treated. My main point is that when the social function of the school falls most heavily on certification then we cannot any longer treat the child as a child, but must treat him always as an impending adult. The courts have long recognized in the principle of "attractive nuisance" that one must take more than moderate caution against the vagaries of youth. They

cannot be expected to behave like adults, and so what may be reasonably prudent behavior in guarding against liability for accidents to adults may not be regarded as sufficient prudence in guarding against liability for injury to youth. The principle is the court's way of acknowledging that boys will be boys, and children unaccountably adventurous. And yet in our schools we seem to be bent on treating children as though they were already adults, as though their behavior must be orderly, regulated and disciplined at all times. The irony of what I have in mind is beautifully illustrated by an incident that occurred not long ago in an elementary school in my own neighborhood. A child who had spoken "out-of-turn" in gym class was made to sit perfectly motionless for the entire recreation period under pain of having to repeat his immobility if he so much as moved a muscle during the period. Or again, there is the Junior High, not particularly exceptional, in which the students are prohibited from speaking in the cafeteria line and must go from class to class in single file. Is this kind of behavior normal for children twelve and thirteen years old? The common pleading in defense of such control is usually that it is essential for the order of the school--and secondly that it is a part of preparation for the adult society. But, one must answer, it is also normal for children to be children.

One is tempted to observe that just as the certification function of the school serves the symbolic purposes of the adult world, so the emphasis on social control in the

school serves the purposes of the managers and other adult incumbents of the school. It is, in part at least, a consequence of the focus on outcome. That the social control in the school may become dysfunctional for education. The school is then likely to become an institution structurally and culturally so ordered as to serve the adult productive goals of those who manage it rather than to serve the purpose of educating the students in it. In this strict sense one can say that the school becomes a pathological institution.

My third point has to do with the fact that as certification and sorting become the primary functions of schooling, as opposed to education, then we would expect certain social roles in the schools to be strained, twisted, and given a weight all out of proportion to what otherwise would be expected. James McClellan and Paul Komisar have clearly and accurately pointed out the most significant changes taking place.[5] Schooling in modern American life, they point out, has increasingly taken on the character of a contest, a contest whose rewards are substantial, visible, and tangible. As a consequence, in this contest, as in any other where success is of such enormous importance, it becomes necessary to make increasingly precise discriminations between different levels of success. In the contest of schooling, that means testing, and testing with increasing powers of discrimination. As the selecting and sorting function of schooling becomes more important, as it surely

will, then the schools will increasingly require technically competent professionals to carry out its main tasks. The strategic person in the school will become not the teacher but the guidance counselor.

What interests me here is the power and status of the guidance counselor and the conflicts and tensions generated by his professional training as over against his changing social role. The counselor is a man who has certain technical knowledge not shared by other members of the school staff. He knows about internal and external testing programs, about means, norms, standard deviations and diagnostic tests. He is the keeper of certain records. He knows about applying to colleges, entrance exams, advanced placement and all the rest. These are not matters of primary importance in the day to day tasks of the school, but they are of extraordinary importance to the certifying and sorting tasks.

In the educational profession, however, there is a customary distinction between the counseling function and the guidance function of the staff. It is a fact, I think, that the training of the guidance counselor places a greater weight on the clinical and therapeutic task of counseling. But I have been arguing that the actual social function of the school makes it incumbent upon him to focus on the quite different task of guidance, selection and sorting. The logistical problem of getting the right student together with the right teacher at the right time and the right financial assistance to the right student for the right college, these are technical problems which require a high

level of professional competence, and a well developed program of public relations, and these functions, of such enormous importance, conflict with the therapeutic and clinical focus of the professional's training. It constitutes a role conflict of great importance to study.

As the function of schooling becomes more focused in the sorting and selecting function, other role conflicts will emerge and require some resolution. In the first place, as the technical competence of the guidance staff is more clearly articulated we should expect the guidance counselor to take on a kind of "priestly function." He becomes possessor of certain skills and technical knowledge which set him apart from the rest of the staff and establish him in a quasi-administrative position of enormous influence and increasingly distinguished from the teaching faculty. This would produce a new, elevated, and in many ways protected status in the social organization of the school. In the second place, it is quite clear that this same development cannot help but make the guidance counselor a primary spokesman for the school in its relations to parents, other schools, and to the community in general. In short he must be expected to take on some of the functions previously exercised by the principal.

In short, the role of the guidance counselor is strategic to study because of its importance in reinforcing the tendency to couch the language of teaching, schools, and

schooling increasingly in terms of output and product. Moreover, the changes of role and status which I have been describing are clearly taking place in American schools. That in itself is strong evidence that the social functions of schools and schooling are in fact being transformed and that increasing emphasis is falling on the task of sorting, selecting, and certifying the human resources of American society. Whether we like it or not, the tendency is strong and the evidence is convincing that the function of schooling in American society is not so much to provide an informed electorate as it is to shape the human resources of the nation to "fit" its economic and military requirements. Youth are resources.

Of these observations, the one I wish to stress most strongly is the one having to do with the ethos of the con-game. I have found it extremely helpful to study the mechanism of the con-game, and have been startled to discover, for example, how closely the language and school behavior of secondary students parallels the technical argot and social behavior of pick-pockets and "hustlers". There are stark resemblances between these activities. They all depend upon the development of certain social skills. The con-game, for example, depends upon the capacity to discern how the "mark" defines himself, realizing of course that a "good" mark will idealize himself as possessing certain characteristics which he does not in fact possess.

Thus, the con-artist defines a likely mark as one who fancies himself as shrewd in matters of finance and a keen judge of man. The con-artist then plays upon this idealized self-perception in order to "take" the "mark" for a substantial sum of money. The mark is a person much less capable than he thinks, a sucker rather than a shrewd operator.

There are two features of this phenomenon worthy of further comment. The first is that the con-artist tries to get what he wants by acting in such a way as to reinforce the self-image of his victim. This frequently requires the adoption of a rather calculated mode of behavior, i.e., a fairly "cool" presentation of one's self. This usually means that one must contrive to act the way one's victim wishes one to act. It is helpful sometimes in the con-game for the artist to appear fumbling, inept, and in need of sage advice. In the school, the same process often requires one to appear quiescent, agreeable, and well disciplined, but in both cases what one learns is to play a certain role in a calculated fashion. The second point I wish to stress is an immediate consequence of the first. It is simply that the con-game stresses the capacity not to take the overtly defined situation seriously. That is, the con-artist must act inept without being so; he must be able to elicit advice, appear to take it seriously and yet not do so. In other words, the con-game is an interesting miniature of what we often call alienation. It involves a kind of

detachment. It involves a presentation of the self without that presentation actually being the definition of the self. This represents a high social skill. I would hypothesize that it is this high social skill which is rewarded when the school's primary function is certification and selection, and that many so-called academic failures are in fact failures simply to learn the con-game of the school. In short, the development of this detachment and calculated mode of behavior may be more important to academic success than many other factors of socio-economic status and mental ability.

The high social skills involved in learning the con-game of the school may be highly functional for modern American life for the simple reason that we are becoming an urban society. What can we say about the phenomenal experience of people growing up in an urban, secular, highly organized society in which there is an attenuation of primary associations? There is one proposition which is clearly beyond question because it is virtually analytic. It is that urban society is filled with strangers. The second proposition is that in such a society the secondary, casual, fairly structured encounters between people gain in significance. Most of the people that we deal with are strangers. And yet in dealing with these strangers one must be able to communicate efficiently and effectively, and that often means that one must present oneself as something

that one really is not--just a bit brighter, a bit more competent, a bit more sophisticated than one really is. Moreover, in those dealings one must be content to let strangers remain strangers. The ideals of intimacy, of primary associations, of I-Thou relations tend to atrophy and become irrelevant for large segments of urban life. Urban man is more profoundly public in his actions, and by the same token he can become more profoundly personal in the smaller sphere of his privacy. Under these conditions a premium is placed upon the efficiency of the actor and his capacity for a certain detachment or alienation from his activities. He must learn not to take them too seriously. In short, I wish to suggest that the high social skills of the con-artist may be indispensable in the urban setting of life. It may be precisely these skills which it is essential to develop in young people for life in modern American society. The school whose primary function is certification and selection is well adapted to serve this purpose, and for that reason such a school is in a strong position in American society. But the cost in human lives and human failure is enormous.

It is clear that this state of affairs is precisely what for years we have viewed with alarm and even condemnation. We are not accustomed to view with approval the calculated, contrived skills of the con-artist with their potential for deception. Read, as I did, the plays that were

popular in American in the last decade of the nineteenth century. They have, almost without exception, the same theme. The hero is the clear-headed, transparent, honest and sincere country boy who came to the city from up-state New York or down-state Illinois. There he was confronted with the calculating, scheming, false city boy. He was a stranger and he was taken in. But in the end, it was always the clean, forthright, plain spoken, and sincere boy from the country who won out. Not even then was virtue its own reward. Its reward was rather the success of this world which always comes to the boy of virtue and honesty if he will but persevere.

Need I make the point explicit? I am suggesting that in our intellectual tradition, we have little on which to draw to celebrate the life of the city and endorse the kinds of social behavior which it seems to require. What was condemned as bad and corrupting in the plays to which I referred may be exactly the kind of skill, exactly the conception of the moral agent which makes sense in the city. The transformation of America from a rural and agrarian to an urban and technological, manipulative society may reach so far as to carry with it a literal transformation of the very idea of a moral agent.

Throughout the history of western moral theory there have been three fundamental metaphores which have governed. There has been the idea of man the pilgrim, the

searcher and creator of what is good. The idea is central in classical thought and in the utilitarians of the nineteenth century. The central question was "What is the good for man?" The second image has been the vision of man the law-giver, the legislator to himself. The central moral question from this perspective was "What is right?" "What is lawful?" This is the fundamental question in the theory of duty. The third metaphor has had to do with the image of man the artist. The central moral question becomes not what is right or what is good, but what is "fitting," what is appropriate. This is the central focus of the moral-sense school and is a strong element in the Greek conception of hamartia and of life as an art, a techne, or a skill.

I wish to suggest that in the American experience the conception of the moral life has been powerfully shaped by the character of life in the New England town and the frontier. It has been an experience informed by religions, specifically Puritan, ideas with their focus on the theory of duty as opposed to prudence; a frontier experience which afforded the individual a considerable space to maneuver and permitted him a considerable panche. In short, the focus has been on the right and the good with relatively little emphasis on what is effective, prudent, practically wise and technically efficient. Yet in modern American society it is precisely these latter emphases which count. In the modern,urban, technically oriented, highly organized

world, the initial moral question may not be what is right or good, but "what is happening?" What is happening to me, to my neighbor, and how, by what techne, can I do something about it? The moral agent becomes much more the public agent, the political agent. He becomes the man who is able in effect to "read the signs of the times," to discern the occasions for action as they present themselves, to accurately pick and choose where it is best to act, through what means, and with what expected temporary gains and losses. This is a much closer wedding of prudence, political sense, or what Aristotle called phrenesis, practical wisdom, than anything we have understood as moral action before. The moral agent in this sense has need of techne, social skill, and the needed skills are largely captured in the techniques of the con-artist.

The trouble with the high social skills of the con-artist is neither that they are bad nor that they are inappropriate for American society. They are essential skills to develop in the process of socialization. One can and must possess these skills without being a thief. The one does not imply the other. The difficulty is rather that they are simply skills. The ideas of effectiveness and efficiency of action are not moral concepts at all. They are technical concepts. The danger is that we shall develop technical competence without developing a technical conscience. The skills of the con-artist are indispensable for urban

America. The schools, partly because of their overwhelming function of selection and sorting are successful in producing these skills. Yet it is precisely this technical social skill which the school develops in practice and repudiates in theory. This places a hopeless burden on teachers and young people, and it is fraught with danger for American life. No society, to the best of my knowledge, has long survived with a technical ethic. The best example, is Homeric society in which it could be said, "The qualities of a man are best displayed in ambush," this is the ultimate in the ethics of success. It is a view most suitable to a society which cherishes the arts of war.

This then is the more profound sense in which there is a crisis in American mass education. It is a crisis in the very conception of a moral agent and a member of society. The problem is not simply the universal contrast between the real and the ideal. That contrast must always exist in every society. The problem is not to overcome that distinction, but rather to make it intelligible. The problem is the formation of a technical conscience. It is to interpret the human values of the American and Western tradition so that they can be formulated in technical terms. How, to be specific, do we educate to an understanding of service as a matter of technical competence? If we fail to do this we shall have failed to communicate what it means to render service in the concrete life of the professions and the family, and in the political affairs of the community. This then is the problem.

The dilemma is somewhat different. When the schools become excessively concerned with the social functions of certification, selection and sorting, then schooling becomes a technical problem of providing suitable technical skills for aspirants in a technical society. When that happens, the schools may become suitable places for developing technical competence, and poor places for the formation of a technical conscience. But when schools and schooling are separated from the process-product image of schooling and liberated from the certification function, then they can be truly liberal and educative. For this reason we must look for the real revolution in American education to grow from those educational agencies which are a part of the education of the public supported by the public and yet outside the usual "system" of education. This is the revolutionary significance of the Free University movement, the national tutoring movement, the job corps and similar agencies.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The Genius of American Education (Random House, New York), p. 6.

[3] The Dignity of Youth and Other Atavisms, Beacon Press, 1965.

[4] See Dewey's Discussion in Education and Experience, Chapter II.

[5] "Educational Innovations: Social Evolution or Social Revolution?," Temple University Alumni Review, Fall 1965, p. 26-29.

Discussion Following Green Paper

Kimball: I would like to comment first on the title which was "The Nature of the Crisis in Mass Education," and in particular on two aspects of the title. One aspect is mass. The person most active in promoting this idea of "mass society" was Paul Lazersfeld who did his research on the basic assumption that you could use survey techniques and treat individuals as if there were no structure to the society at all. By treating each individual as one you could handle things statistically. But when Paul began to look at this materials he began to see that people didn't behave in this way; rather they behaved out of social cohesion that came from group memberships. He then modified his techniques and really abandoned the whole approach. I would like to suggest that the concept of "mass" society, "mass" education, leads us in the wrong direction. We can talk of universal education. But American society is composed of innumerable types and varieties of human groupings solving a variety of purposes.

My comment on crisis is slightly different. At a meeting some years back Kroeber made one of his off hand remarks on crisis. He said he hoped we would get over this sense that we are living in a period of crisis and added that the crisis concept is relative. Kroeber didn't see any crisis at all. He felt this was just an idiom we were using. I would like to suggest that while it may well be that we are in a state of crisis there is also another way of looking at this and that is to say that we are in a

period of accelerated change. When you use the word crisis this suggests a certain tone and places things in a particular context.

I would now like to place your remarks in some kind of context. In your paper you are concerned with the nature of the congruency between the educational system schooling and society. But is your description a report on the remnants of an agrarian culture in American society which is dysfunctional to contemporary culture or is what you report a forecast of the future? Is what you report something we are moving out of or something we are moving into? I think we could probably argue both of these and I would like to develop the framework from which I would make my arguments on either side.

The agrarian cultures of the world, and this includes American culture to the modern period, all resemble each other in that they are societies of fixed and limited positions, of limited wealth and goods, and of unequal distribution. The school systems reflect these differentials in the kind of schooling that is available and they are essentially conservative. This is true of American society in the very recent past. But we are now in a period of accelerated change in which we are moving to a kind of society of immense potentialities and possibilities for everyone. Part of our disturbance is that the society we are emerging from has not had this pattern of potentiality.

Connected with this is the fact that there are now skilled attempts by people in our major institutions, universities, hospitals, government, etc. to develop rational understandings about the world and to use such understanding to produce. Why we do this is a moral question that does not concern us here. But the high priests of contemporary society are the scientists and the ethic of our society is a scientific ethic. There is a question concerning the nature of the connection between what occurs at these rarified scientific levels and in the rest of the society. Is the rest of society being increasingly separated from or being manipulated by those who have developed these insights into the contemporary world? Is it participating only in the material consequences of such developments? I cannot answer this question but I would say that the highest form of morality does exist among those engaged in the process of discovery.

I would also suggest that in moving from an agrarian society to a modern scientific metropolitan one all aspects of our society have not changed to the same degree. Education in particular has changed less than other areas because in some sense it is the most conservative of our institutions. But there is a more important reason than conservatism for this lag. In large measure the people who are administrators, teacher trainers and the teachers themselves until recently were basically removed from the main currents of developing intellectuality in our society. The closed system of teacher

education kept out the flow of ideas. This is now changing and groups outside professional education have become interested in the schools and in the content of material--physicists, mathematicians, etc., This meeting itself is a sign of that.

Another point is that only recently have we discovered the power of deliberate education. Partly out of the process of consciously looking at ourselves we have come to discover how significant what happens to the person in the educational system is. If he is not successful in school he is a casualty of our society. The school is the one institution through which everyone must move successfully to become incorporated into the adult world.

My last point is a humorous one. Education may be in a crisis because anthropologists have discovered it.

I want now to refer to a few of the main ideas you presented. You say the functions of education are socialization, transmission of culture which I would call enculturation, and self identity. Then you argue that the function of the school is certification and trace the consequences of this. If the evidence shows that the certification function is the basic one then I would be concerned because the basic function should be enculturative. I don't know to what extent certification is primary. Certainly it is and must be present in our schools--I can conceive of no system without selection and certification.

With reference to the consequences, I would like

to talk only of the con game. This is an intriguing and ingenious idea, and I agree with you that it is a high social skill. I only caution that we should not get "conned" by this idea. While the con game and phoniness and superficiality and other things are in the system we must also recognize that the educational system in the United States has done a remarkable job. This doesn't mean this is the kind of system we want nor does it mean that changes aren't needed but we must give recognition to what we have accomplished thus far.

Another point that you make is that educational institutions are arranged to satisfy the needs and convenience of those who run them rather than of the clients. But this is also true of hospitals, prisons, the army, etc. There has to be a revolution in our procedures so that they are run for the students.

The last thing I would like to refer to is the notion you posed of the morality of responsibility. You were using it in a different sense than is ordinarily the case, in the sense of respond-ability which is adjustment to. Is this correct?

Green: Well it is a slippery term. How can one be responsible with respect to the practices of advertising if one does not know or there is no social method for holding people accountable? Responsibility requires respondability in the society.

Kimball: But if there is no accountability we are gliding along the surface of things. I mentioned the word prudence

and I want to speak of that. Our society demands prudence because we cannot run the complex technical and social apparatus without people being responsible, by which I mean accountable, and having a deeply ingrained sense of prudence.

Now your point about war. I can conceive of no society in the world more aggressive than American society. But one must remember that this agressiveness is both destructive and constructive. We have war in Viet Nam but we also have war on poverty, ignorance, river pollution and the like. I recently read the report of the President of Harvard University. What he said was this: If only the power of Harvard could be brought to the whole world we would make significant changes in the world. This is aggressive imperialism. I don't want war either but aggressiveness is deeply built into our society and is one of the things that makes it. If you eliminate this we don't have our kind of world anymore.

Green: Kimball asked if I was talking about the remnants of agrarian society or something that is coming. I don't know but that isn't the important thing. Part of what I am trying to get at goes back to the fact that I find it hard to understand how to develop a sense of self-identity through education without some historical continuity. Education is not describable simply in terms of enculturation; it has other meanings, humanistic ones. Education must express something of what we have understood of our past in our tradition about

the nature of man. When I say the school's certification function is dysfunctional for education I am saying it in both senses: it is dysfunctional for the development of a sense of self-identity in so far as this is involved in enculturation, and also this notion of the con game, of the man of too cool prudence, does not represent our past traditions of values on thought and education. Kimball stopped just short of the point of saying that education goes beyond acculturation but that is my underlying assumption.

There is a whole morality connected with the con game; the moral agent is the accommodator, the adjuster. But this does not represent our historic tradition. We have got to find a way to preserve the values of the past in a setting which is more heavily laden with prudential considerations so that the child can grow up respecting the agrarian past and its values and cherish something important in American life.

Diamond: I don't think if we view American history we can profitably explain our exercise of prudence by our technology. We have tremendous waste and pollution of natural resources and this is not the sign of an advanced industrial society which has grown prudentially. I would like to have some specific examples of the prudential use of internal power.

Hanvey: I wanted to suggest that it might be possible for schools to stay preoccupied with certification and at the sametime increase their educative capacity. Do you think this is a possibility?

Green: I think it is necessary to find a way to do this but on this point I'm not optimistic. I don't see many signs of this in the university.

Wax: I think you did something interesting in your paper because you appealed to the spirits of Merton and Parsons and then gave us a Goffmanian analysis of the school. But your application of Goffman is limited since you speak of the con game exclusively on the middle-class level and in relation to certification. Of course the con game is more richly played at the lower class and ethnic level. This ties in with what Kimball was saying about the way in which our culture is aggressive, one can look at the school system in some sense as being aggressively directed against ethnic and lower class elements. We are going to go in and change these people. That is what the war on poverty is about; it's not a war on poverty, it's a war on the poor. The poor respond especially in school by a variety of the con game which is directed back against the teacher. We have to see two different kinds of con games: the middle class one which is directed towards getting that certificate and the lower class one which is designed to keep one's self-identity.

Horton: I would like to by-pass the question of the con game and approach the whole question that has been raised in a different way. One of the most thrilling experiences of recent years has been the emergence of the student movement of a considerable and effective dedicated group of college and

high school students. This is one of the best products of our educational system. In contrast to this we can see another phenomenon most recently exemplified in Truman Capote's "IN COLD BLOOD," the emergence of completely amoral, conscienceless, confused and cruel men who are also a product of our society and of whom we apparently have a great number. The latter represents one of the least educated segments of our population, the former, represent the maximum of our education since they have gone through the entire system. Does this have any meaning? If it were true that the system had a destructive effect the more you had of it the more destroyed you would be. Yet it is just the opposite which is true. Perhaps we need examine not just the school but the other educational institutions to which our young people are exposed. The mass media, the whole advertising and merchandising industry that exploits our young people, these constitute another school system and that has not been sufficiently examined. It could be argued that the less formal schooling people have the more they get educated in the mass media.

Cohen: Dr. Horton has made a very important point, namely that we often tend to look at one or another aspect of our society depending on which axe we have to grind and say that this is the product of our system forgetting completely the other products. Go back to the tightly knit clan community at the horticultural or peasant level and try to have the

equivalent of a teach-in movement or a Viet Nam Day Committee and see what the consequences of that certification system are. One of the things we can ask is why has the certification system been taken out of the hands of the local group and placed in the hands of the educational system? What implications does this have? Then I think we can legitimately come back to the question you have raised concerning the consequences this has for the educational system. But let us try to keep these things in some perspective.

Green: This is what I would hope for from the anthropologist, a knowledge of the variety of social institutions that perform these functions.

Cohen: But aren't you making some kind of a judgement by calling it a con game, which incidentally you find in every society?

Diamond: What you would call a teach-in in tribal society is a perfect example of the misplaced concrete. One simply couldn't imagine that kind of a dynamic.

Cohen: That is exactly the point.

Rosenfeld: Because Green looked at the schools as being non-educative in their functions he examined the non-educative aspects only. Obviously along with certification some education goes on. I would therefore hope for a companion paper on this at some future meeting.

Green's paper has pointed out some things we should have known not precisely in this perspective. However, if we

take this analogy of the con game and extend it, it does not hold up in all instances. If there is a con game in which child is pitted against teacher then we have left out the real con agent, the teacher. But if teacher is really con man how do teachers come into this game when at one time they were its victims? Do they go into teaching because they couldn't con their way into other positions or is education the best of all con games? Again, neither teacher nor child controls the course as it were, since both are conning one another in the school over which they have little control. Who then is the con man? Finally one of the distinctions between teacher as con man and a gambler or hustler is that the hustler does it without a sense of guilt but teacher lives with guilt and so does child. Thus when one extends the analogy many questions arise concerning its usefulness.

Nonetheless, this session presents exactly the type of discussion I would have hoped for at this meeting since we are really talking about values. There is nothing more important that we can address ourselves to than this question and guidelines should be mapped out at this meeting to determine what is the instruction by way of values and belief systems that we pass to our children in our public schools.

Gussow: Reference has been made to the American agrarian society but I wonder how many of us here actually have our roots in that society and how many of us have our roots in

Europe. Perhaps many of us are still in the process or socialitization or enculturation to American national character and hence find it difficult to live in a society where others find it easy to live. One way that many minority groups handle the problem of trying to become Americans is to professionalize the stigma and become social scientists. You study the system and try to understand it.

I don't like the term con game; I don't like Goffman. Goffman is not telling us anything new, he has just developed a new vocabulary. There are other ways of referring to the process besides con game, learning the rules of the cognitive map of society. His reference to con game is nothing more than what he talks about in reference to total institutions. Elementary and secondary schools come close to some of these notions about total institutions. They face the bureaucratic problem of managing and moving large numbers of people with a small staff. Obviously in this situation many things become routinized. I think we can put it into other language besides con game.

I'm also surprised that no one made reference to the free Universities that are springing up. Horton spoke of students who are saying, in fact, that they want to be educated not certified. I think this is the philosophy underlying the Free Universities. There is a lot of public disfavor of these people--we call them

beatniks and the like--but they represent philosophically some of the things we appear to favor here. However, I think that if we took a poll amongst ourselves of some of our more personal attitudes to the Free Universities some of us would be ambiguous or ambivalent about how we wanted to characterize them.

I'd also like to discuss the concept of crisis. Anthropology is a funny science; it always has to re-discover the world all by itself. I think we're doing this now in education. We've discovered it, its a new toy, and we're disturbed by it. But after a while we might calm down a little and look at it with perhaps another eye.

Green: I hope people won't focus on con game. I don't give it any particular emphasis. I just use it for convenience.

Gussow: You can't get away from it that easily.

Green: It's just a way of making a point.

Gussow: But you make the wrong point.

start

~~John~~ Malcolm Collier: I would like to comment on one aspect of the curriculum development projects which I think touches on the relationships between education and society, educa= tion moral quality and education and interpersonal rela= tionships. For the most part these projects have been focusing on induction as a pedagogical strategy. It seems to me that its focus on induction has something to do with the rest of society since it related children in school

to those researchers and scientists from whom the educational system had become separated. It has something to do with education and moral qualities since in contrast to systems where textbook is king the youngster has a chance to become responsible for some of his own activities and growth within the school. Finally an induction method offers a chance to redefine and rethink the student-teacher relationships. To the extent that this method works it may change somewhat the qualities we have been attributing to the teacher. But if these projects have this quality of induction it is interesting to consider the system and whether the nature of the system makes it more or less likely that they will work. Those of us who have been working on the curriculum development program have no doubts about their validity or potential contribution; the question is how do you get it to work.

Foshay: It seems to me that it is the proper province of the social sciences to point out moral outrage where it occurs and it is outrageous that among other things schools teach a con game. It seems to me that anthropologists should go right ahead and examine the operation and call it to the attention of the general society.

Second, with respect to certification I suggest that the difference between the agrarian society my father was part of and the urban society I am a part of is that in

the agrarian society certification was not necessary in any official sense since towns were small, standards were there and available all the time certification became necessary when the number of people got larger. It is ironic that at present we have placed the power in people who by definition are more or less alienated and rejected, the teachers. Business men complain that the best college graduates want to go where the power is, into education. They may talk idealistically but I would hypothesize that people are drawn to the point of power and education is where power is right now.

As you read your paper I remembered Wiley's "VILLAGE IN THE VAUCLUSE." The village was populated by people who had one thing in common, they were rejected by the Lycee when they were 11 years old. Here is a town made up of people who early in life had an official and powerful rejection and today they vote for fringe parties and for communists. And I though of revolts, not only in Harlem and the like but also I wondered whether the Berkeley revolt might not be related. Berkeley changed its entrance requirements and five years later they had a revolt.

I agree that there's a crisis in mass education and this has to do with our treatment of people as a mass instead of as individuals; our treatment of the school as a place that certifies people for social membership

rather than as a place where you realize your personal hopes. What would the solution be? We must place certification back in the hands of the individual, allow him influence over how he judges others so that he doesn't use certificates as the major information but asks "who are you?" rather than "what college did you graduate from?"

I did a little study in Missouri some years ago and discovered among other things that these children didn't have a vocabulary of praise. They had a wonderful vocabulary of scorn, they had various terms like helpfulness or nice but they had no means of expressing positive human relationships.

Fuchs: Dr. Foshay has touched no one point I wished to make, the selectivity function. Selection goes on all the time, the schools know it happens, but we get difficulty within the educational system in relation to this sorting function when there is intense competition for limited numbers of high status positions in society. This is something we should look at.

I also think that as anthropologists we shouldn't be so worried about the ideal and real. There's always an ideal and a real and if we really want to know what education is we have to look very hard.

I agree with Green about the need for historical perspective. We have come a long way since

Jefferson and we no longer live in the kind of society that can afford to keep children in school for just three years. We must find ways of containing the vast and growing number of unproductive people for longer and longer times. Thus it becomes frightening to the larger society when people refuse to fit into the container, to stay in school. The Free Universities Gussow spoke of are unpopular because they are feared; they don't fit. The same is true of the drop-out problem. Why is it such a problem? We know that the kind of schooling the drop-out gets when he is pushed back into the container does not do him much good in terms of life chances; but at least he's in the container. One of the problems we might concern ourselves with is what are the alternatives, what can we do with people whom we don't need for production?

Horton: I want to offer some reflection on this conference. I wouldn't know if I hadn't been told that this was a conference of anthropologists concerned with education. There has been criticism and moral indignation but there are educational critics who do a better job on this. Moreover, its more specifically an anthropologist's job. What does the anthropologist have to bring? With regard to our society I don't know whether a group of anthropologists can offer to do anything the sociologists haven't done or couldn't do better. Perhaps we do have a special angle to contribute, the study of the place of the educational

institution in American society, but we have been approaching the whole thing in the opposite way. We have approached the educational institution first and rather neglected the society. What is the con game but a reflection of the fact that we live in a society organized on the basis of competition? We build an educational system which is highly competitive and this conning by student of teacher is no more than the use of devices that are standard in all forms of competition in our society. As a matter of fact, if you wanted to defend education you could look at students getting together to cheat on an exam as a way of mitigating the cruelty of our concept of competition; it's something to celebrate. If we really followed the book we'd be producing monsters but the social processes in the schools tend to mitigate this; the kids get together and refuse to accept this level of competitiveness. My point is that as anthropolists we ought to look at society and ask what it is doing to our schools rather than the other way around. If we don't do this we will make fools of ourselves since we will find out what the school people already know.

The other point is that everyone looks at the anthropologist as the man who has the ability to make cross-cultural comparisons. Yet we haven't had a word on this here. There's been no reference

to schools in other parts of the world which might give us perspectives on American schools. Thus we must do one or both of these things: either approach the school from the point of view of the whole social order or approach it from a comparative point of view.

Boggs: I would like to offer a few empirical comments on certification. I detect an attitude in parents and teachers, a feeling that while it would be nice if the child had a good experience it doesn't really matter what happens to him in school so long as he stays in school. This is why the drop-out problem has captured our imagination; we recognize that if the certification function is not fulfilled something terrible has happened.

Another thing that is happening is that there is a tremendous emphasis among students to pick the occupation that will interest them. This approaches a quest for the Holy Grail. It is obviously connected with their sense of identity, with some sense of what interests them, and all of this is related to occupational choice and certification. This trend is growing. Finally, as a teacher when I look to educational records as certification what I look for is evidence that the candidate has been exposed to the educational system and has responded. This kind of certification is not an alternative to education.

Wilkie: It seems to me that we do have this characteristic in our educational system of manipulating people and not

treating them as true human beings. But I know of no culture, including our own agrarian past, in which this is less true. Today it seems to me among my students there is an interest in Martin Buber's I-Thou relationship and in treating people as human beings and not in manipulative fashion. This is a real vogue on college campuses. I know of no other time or no other culture when there was more concern with this or more interest in it on the part of teachers. I think one of the things we are talking about here comes from an increased awareness of the discrepancy between the ideal and real rather than the development of something new.

I think the distinction between education and accreditation is extremely important and one that I personally face in my teaching. One of the most obvious problems is the grading system, how do you grade students? Some of the better medical schools are separating the education from the accreditation function. Without wishing to oversimplify I think the separation of these can be handled at a very simple level without changing the whole society by separating roles so that one person evaluates and another teaches.

Leacock: We all appear to be interested in change but as I sit here I feel very uncomfortable because we seem to keep veering back and forth. Certainly the society has produced our school system and we can't exactly sit here and decide

how to change society overnight. At the same time the sources of change within the school seem to be very limited. What then can we do? What are the sources for change? It seems to me the real source of change are the unaccredited: the student movement which is concerned with education and not schooling, and community people who have been complaining about this system. There is a tremendous concern in our communities where people look to schools as an avenue of mobility. In lower income Negro and White schools youngsters indicate a wish to go to college with time? Parents and children come to realize that the school serves to block rather than aid them and there is a tremendous disillusionment which is variously expressed, increasingly in group forms. This is a real avenue for change which we have not discussed. We are so far removed from it. What can and should be done here? Certainly there are things individuals can do but can we as a group do something to assess more seriously the nature of these pressures and determine if there is some way they can be made more influential and more adequately organized in their attempt to influence the school system?

Metraue: I usually assume that a discussion of this kind has as one of its purposes a kind of increasing self awareness--what are we saying when we say something. My comment is largely at this level. When we say we are going to discuss the crisis in mass education it seems to me that by definition

American culture crisis simply means that you are at the point where you think you should do something.

To take up the increasingly discussed con game, I think that what has been disturbing us is our habit, when we want to say something good, of phrasing it in a negative way. What we are actually talking about on a larger scale is that we have developed a culture with situational adaptation and the con game is one version of it. We don't like the extent to which it seems to be taking over but shouldn't we be focusing on the larger issue, the fact that we have a society in which we do not have fixed goals, fixed types of moral judgement. The school here is the expression of our society.

Green: What you say is extremely interesting to me. I've always had the impression that a dominant metaphor in anthropology is what I have come to call the resonance metaphor; that is, in most culture you want to see the fashion in which different conceptions such as male-female harmonize and resonate with each other. Now it seems to me if I understand what you are suggesting, that the resonance metaphor which is contextual and not situational would be inapplicable to American culture.

Potash: I would like to go back to our earlier discussion of the role of the school in the total social system. It seems to me we have said very little about the relationship of the schools to the economic system, perhaps because much

of this is self-evident, but I would at least like to point to the obvious link between occupation as an index of social status, our ideal committment to a system of achievement based on universalistic criteria and the utilization of schools as agents for certification. In so far as schools select for technical competence and personality those individuals who meet eligibility requirements for various occupational positions there is pressure not only on the students but also on the teachers to make judgments in a "fair" and "objective" way. I think it is wrong to attempt to cast the teacher as villain of the piece or con agent. I agree that certification is in many ways dysfunctional to education in a humanistic sense but it seems to me that much of the pressure for certification relates to our economic system and our social stratification system, and perhaps we need to take a closer look at this. As a small example one of the major selling points for education is occupational advance. Children are urged to stay in school in order to earn X dollars more per year. This kind of orientation relates to our entire culture and system of values: it has tremendous impact on the way in which we view education, on the motives of students and is not simply a product of the increased certification role of the school alone. In similar fashion there are, I suspect, numerous influences on curriculum development and selection which relate to our economic system and the stress placed on

technical rather than humanistic values. Thus I see some of the problems of a humanistic education as relating in a more general way to our culture.

John Collier: There is a powerful factor which has not been mentioned at all today and one that teachers meet from all sides, the influence of mental health consideration on education. Schools are terribly concerned with problems with reference to personality and individuality of mass education. Students in particular, but educators also are concerned with the problem of spontaneity. Decision making about mass education is very much concerned with problems that fall under the rubric of mental health and the growth of counselor departments in teachers colleges show it. Thus there are efforts to offset the threats posed by mass education.

Cohen: Dr. Horton spoke about students joining together to resist pressures from teachers. I'd like to report my experiences in connection with this. The community in which I lived was made up largely of college people from the university and people from the high school, of professional educators. This is one place where students not only never cheat but they won't even help each other with homework. And this reflects the values of professional educators.

There's one theme that seems to have been running through this conference and which we keep coming back to, almost as though we're surprised by it--that we cannot

think of the educational system as a self-contained system but that it exists within the society and is responding to the total society. This seems to be one theme on which there is consensus.

Another thing that I think is very important is our awareness that the educational system has taken over asthe prime mover or prime agency of cultural transmission. In this sense it is not a question of the school being an agent of change or stability since as a prime mover it is both. One of the things we need to find out is how does it work, how does it transmit both simultaneously.

Kimball: I would like to amend your statement. The school is not becoming the main focus of cultural transmission. Goodenough points out in this book as McClellan and I do in ours that there is a public and a private world, there is a dichotomous nature to our society. The family is still a very significant element in the socialization of the child, as is the peer groupsand all of the aspects of individual behavior in informal and private arrangements.

GREAT TRADITION, LITTLE TRADITION, AND FORMAL EDUCATION

Murray and Rosalie Wax

From a comparative and historical perspective, the vast body of research literature on schools and education appears both psuedo-empirical and psuedo-theoretical. Researchers have been administering hundreds of tests to thousands of pupils. Meantime, intellectual critics have devoted countless pages to the criticism of textbooks and other curricular materials. Yet, the bulk of their efforts contrasts markedly with its quality and its impact, because their vision has been constricted by an interlocking chain of assumptions: that schools are primarily and exclusively agencies of formal education (rather than being social institutions); that pupils are isolated individuals (rather than social beings who participate in the life of peer societies, ethnic groups, and the like); that formal education is synonomous with education; and that the principal task of the teacher is to educate. Thus, instead of inquiring what sort of social processes are occurring in -- and in relation to -- the schools, researchers and critics have defined their problem as being one of discovering how to make the schools teach their individual pupils more, better, and faster. Only a few[1] of the many researchers and critics have had the patience, fortified by the faith in ethnographic empiricism, to observe the social processes actually occurring in relation to the schools: among the pupils, among

the teachers, within the classrooms, between the pupils and their parental elders, and so on.

Teachers and pupils being docile and available, it has been far easier and far more pretentiously scientific (while less threatening to the local power structure) to administer reams of tests that are then scored mechanically. As a result, the research literature lacks a solid body of data on the ethnography of schools.

Seemingly, the theoretical literature on education would be far superior. The intellectual critics number some of the most formidably trained scholars in the country, as well as some of the most irate journalists and pontifical classicists. Unfortunately, most seem to lack that sense of history and feeling for comparison that the True Curriculum is presumed to produce. As but a small instance, consider that most of the classically trained critics laud the Hellenic system of education and, from that vantage point, denounce as trivial and unworthy of our schools such courses as Driver Training. Yet, it is surely arguable that being able to drive an automobile courteously, deftly, and responsibly, restraining aggressive impulses, and focussing attention upon the task, is a sign of good citizenship and moral excellence. A really good training in driving an automobile would merit as much approbation as the Hellenic cult of body culture. If the

invidious slur on Driver Training is typical of the logic of the critics (and we take it to be so) then they are sadly deficient in the perspective and knowledge requisite for evaluating modern schools.

Asking the right questions is the path to acquiring wisdom, but to ask good questions, rather than trivial ones, the investigator has to break out of conventional frameworks. In the early part of this essay we proceed autobiographically, outlining how this happened to us so that we came to perceive freshly some of what is going on in relation to the schools. Later in the essay, we build on these experiences and elaborate a more theoretical argument which, in turn, leads to a series of research questions for the study of the culture of schools.

The School and the Little Community

We begin in traditional anthropological fashion by sketching some of what we learned about the educational problems of the Oglala Sioux on the Pine Ridge Reservation. The patient reader will find that this is not simply an ethnographic excursion but leads to a consideration of the nature of education in a modern industrial society.

Our interest in Indian education developed during the several years in which we directed the Workshops for American Indian college students held during the summer on

the campus of the University of Colorado. These workshops had been designed to provide young Indians with a broad perspective about Indian affairs, so that they could serve their communities as advisors and leaders. As we worked with these young people, we were appalled. Supposedly the cream of the Indian population, they were so provincial in the knowledge of the U.S. and so ignorant of Indian history and current affairs as to make us doubt their rank as college students. Yet, at the same time, most of them could be turned on, and to an intense glow, by lectures on Indian history, or Indian religious cults or social organization, in which we treated these phenomena as worthy of serious intellectual attention. Judging by their responses, none had ever participated in a discussion that treated Indian religious cults as vital and meaningful (rather than as superstitious, primitive, or archaic). Accordingly, we developed a critical curiosity about the nature of the educational system wherein these students had been schooled, and we deliberately decided to study an Indian population (the Pine Ridge Sioux) that had for some years been subjected to federal programs for education and assimilation.

At the time we designed the study, we envisioned the school as a battleground: on the one hand, the educators -- flanked by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the mission

churches, and kindred agencies -- would be fighting to pull the children out of Indian society, while, on the other hand, the Indian elders would be clinging desperately to their young, trying to hold them within their traditional society. Indeed, this was exactly the picture drawn for us by a high BIA official on our first day on the reservation, except that, instead of the Indian elders, he blamed "grandma," who craftily lured her grandchildren "back to the blanket."

Our hypothesis about battlegrounds was to prove as inaccurate as his about grandmas and blankets. Nevertheless, it turned out to be extremely advantageous, for it predisposed us to approach the Sioux pupils, their teachers, and the administration, as living members of social groups rather than as isolated respondents to questionnaires administered from a distance. Thus, we were obliged to sit for weeks and months in classrooms, watching what was going on and, in like manner, to talk not only to administrators and educational experts but to Indian parents and to the children themselves. In due time we realized that the educators and Indian elders were not locked in battle for the soul of the Indian child, because the Sioux elders, faced with the power of the educational establishment, simply withdrew. In this tactic they were encouraged by the educational administrators who exhorted

them: just send your children to school every day and we will educate them: The educators found the absence of the parents convenient and proper, since the parents would have had no background for understanding the operations of the school and could only have interfered. Yet, here, the educators were over-confident, for within the schoolrooms they were confronting children who were alien and who could elude their ministrations. Issuing from small local communities of kith and kin, and sharing a common set of values and understandings, as well as a language (Lakota) that was unknown to most teachers, the Sioux children could and did create within the formal structure of the educational institution, a highly cohesive society of their own. As the children matured, their society of peers became ever more solidary, and the teacher confronting them was reduced to operating at the level they would permit. While an occasional teacher might gain the approval of this peer society, most of them found themselves talking to a wall of apparent indifference and assumed incompetence. Interestingly, many teachers remarked that after the six or seventh grade their pupils became more "withdrawn" or "apathetic" every year, but not one realized that the wall was the outward manifestation of a subtle and

highly organized rejection. The withdrawal remained a mystery to the educators.

In another respect, the design of our study differed from the more conventional ethnographic or social anthropolotical investigations, for we committed ourselves to a study of the Indian children in the schools. This meant that we were obliged to consider and try to understand not only Sioux society or culture, but the reservation system (teachers and administrators), and how the Indians related generally to the agencies of the greater society. This committment helped us to perceive very early that the administrators and most of the teachers looked upon the Sioux children not as members of a different or exotic culture but as members of an ethnic and inferior caste. Their task, as they saw it, was to help their pupils become members of the superior caste.

The status of the Sioux as being lower caste was so conspicuously visible among the educators that we singled out one of its manifestations for analysis under the label of "The Vacuum Ideology." The reference is to the experiential background of the Sioux child, for the educators, especially the administrators, did not regard this child as participating in a distinctive

culture and society but, instead, as lacking in those preschool experiences which distinguish the desirable kind of pupil. Judging by the experiences that were listed, the ideal pupil would have been of urban middle-class, Protestant (and White) background, and, insofar as the Sioux pupil lacked those particular experiences, it was not that he had had others but that he was deficient. Since his parents had not read Peter Rabbit to him, he lacked familiarity with stories; and since they did not sing Anglo-Saxon lullabies to him, he lacked familiarity with music. The same ideology is also prevalent among educators confronting children of urban lower-class and ethnic backgrounds.

Subsequent experience has convinced us that many educators are passionately attached to the notion that their disprivileged or poor pupils come to them with empty minds which must be filled before they can compete with youngsters from "the usual middle-class home." Nevertheless, they withdraw in horror from the suggestion that a denial of experience constitutes a denial of socialization or human development. That a little child might not respond warmly to a teacher who sees him and his folks as empty vessels does not occur to them.

Almost in spite of ourselves, we have been led

to the conclusion that some of our most important general educational goals constitute ruthless attacks on the solidarity and self-respect of the ethnic and lower-class communities, and, indeed, on their very existence. The Vacuum Ideology is only one of the more recent tactical offenses. Another is the goal of individualistic achievement.

The modern school system is premised on the notion that its population is an aggregate of social atoms, among whom there are no significant or permanent linkages. In the ideology of the educators, these social atoms begin at the same starting line and then move onward in haphazard clumps, each atom achieving independently of the others and according to its own inner strengths and motives. What an individual does in school, and later, in his vocation, is an achievement -- his individual achievement -- deriving from his own initiative and effort, and of benefit only to himself and his immediate family. Contrary to this ideology is the normative system of a folk community which confronts an alien society. For in this system the individual may excel only when his excellence enhances the position of his brethren. If this achievement were to derogate them before others, then it would be incumbent on him to conceal his talents. Thus,

in the schools on Pine Ridge, our staff observed classrooms where, when the teacher called upon a pupil to recite he would become the target for jibes and jokes, whispered in Lakota and unperceived by the teacher, with the result that he would stand or sit paralyzed and unable to respond; meanwhile, the teacher, being oblivious to the secret life of the classroom, would be perplexed and distressed at her inability to secure responses indicating that she had covered the day's lesson. In like manner, there are the observations of Harry Wolcott who, for his doctoral dissertation taught in a one-room school among Indians on an island off the Northwest Coast. Wolcott reports that, although he taught for a full year, living among the community, he was never able to learn just how much or how little most of his pupils knew, because, no matter what the nature of the classwork -- whether test or seatwork or whathaveyou--no one could be induced to work solely for himself.

The fact that the educators themselves seem unaware that individualistic achievement as they define it is considered grossly immoral behavior by the children they are trying to instruct is an obvious case of selective inattention. But the fact that social researchers are so often indifferent to this type of conflict and to its

implications is more surprising and puzzling. This brings us to the second part of this paper: a consideration of the inadequacy of past and current research on schools and education.

Psuedo-Empirical Research on Education

Because of the fundamental orientation of their research, most investigators have managed to avoid looking at what actually occurs within schools. Since they collect much data, their research appears to be empirical, but in actuality they have been selectively inattentive to important classes of phenomena. Educational physchologists, for example, convert the society of pupils into an aggregate of individual animals, each of whom must be trained to perform certain tasks established by the curriculum. Discovering what the pupils are actually engaged in doing and experiencing is irrelevant to the job which the psychologist has defined for himself, namely structuring the school situation so that each of the human animals is made to learn more and to learn faster. The educational psychologist thus comes to function like the industrial psychologist whose role it is to help increase production. For both, the fundamental tasks are established by the bureaucratically given structure, and the researcher accepts as his goal the devising of

ways to accomplish those tasks most expeditiously. Whatever else may be going on within the school, or however else the child may be being educated, becomes relevant for the researcher only insofar as it clearly affects the performance of the curricularly given tasks.

In like manner, structural-functionalists among sociologists have tended to orient themselves by defining their discipline as "the sociology of education" and by assuming that the school is that institution having education as its primary function. In effect, these plausible assumptions serve to transform the scientific problem of <u>the nature of the school</u> (and its relationship to other social activities) into the problem of evaluating the school in terms of the extent to which it performs a particular <u>educational function</u> (cf Brotz, 1961). If further, the sociologist relies principally upon survey procedures, with rigid schedules administered to large numbers of pupils, then he has thoroughly inhibited himself from the observation of the school as a species of social organization. The pupils are perceived as social atoms, differing from each other in terms of their ethnic-religious and social-class backgrounds, but the school is rarely studied as a society or social system which is more than an arena for the movement of these atoms..

Lest we be misunderstood, we should like to emphasize that the issue is not the learning theory of some psychologists nor the structural-functionalism of some sociologists. Either theory and discipline could be utilized in the empirical study of schools, but in fact they seldom have been, and the research which is done has a flavor that is tragi-comic. For example, investigators known to us are now engaged in elaborate investigations involving, on the one hand, the administration of large batteries of tests to hundreds of Indian and White pupils, and, on the other hand, the observation in detail of the relationships between Indian mothers and their children. The hypothesis informing the research is that the progressive "withdrawal" characteristic of Indian pupils in schools is the outcome of a psychic inadequacy related to their upbringing. Were these investigators to perform some elementary ethnography, inquiring as to how the Indians perceive their community situation and the role of the schools, and if they were then to observe classroom interactions, their comprehension of what they presume to be a psychic inadequacy might be thoroughly transformed. But for this to occur, they would have to be prepared to examine the school as a real institution affecting a real inter-ethnic community of Indians and Whites,

instead of reducing the school to an educational function and dissolving the Sioux child out of his community and his lower-caste situation.

On the other hand, research conducted along Community Study lines has often contributed a great deal to the understanding of the schools (whether or not the research has utilized a structural-functionalist or learning theory conceptualization). The major endeavors (Hollingshead, Havighurst, Wylie, etc.) which have had the school as a focus of the community study are well recognized, but it is important to note that almost any thorough study of a geographic community can contribute to our knowledge of the schools. In Whyte's study of Cornerville, it is necessary to read between the lines to learn about the schools, but in Gans' later study of an ethnically similar community, much can be gained from the brief pages on the topic (1965:129-136). Similar value can be found in the pages relating to the schools in the studies by Withers (1945), Vidich and Bensman (1960), the Hynds, Hughes (1963), Warner and associates (1949), et al. Indeed, the fact that these studies are not focussed on the schools has a certain advantage, for the educationally focussed studies allow their research to be oriented overly much by the ideology of the schools,

and so they spend too many pages in demonstrating that the schools do not provide equal opportunity for achievement and too few pages to describing what the schools actually are doing.

In contrast to these contemporaneous varieties of social research on education is a study so old as to be dated, having been published over thirty years ago. Yet this study, which, to our knowledge, has had no successor, is the only one which comes close to describing the school as an institution. We have in mind Waller's The Sociology of Teaching. His research procedures appear to have been informal, and he seems to have relied mainly upon his own experiences and the reports and diaries of teachers who were students of his, yet, nonetheless, he systematically reviewed the major sorts of interactions associated with being a teacher. As compared with the several, methodologically-sophisticated readers in the sociology of education now on the market, his is the only book that discussed such significant topics as elementary forms of collective behavior within the classroom or the role of ceremonies in the life of the school. In a sense, Waller reviewed the school as a community, and its educators and pupils as social beings participating in the life of the community, and so he produced a monograph that can

serve to suggest directions for research on contemporary schools. Stimulated by his book, we would like here to advance several questions for research on the schools: What kinds of social roles emerge within the schools, among the teachers, the pupils, and the lay public associated with the schools? What social forms emerge within the context of the schools? Are there typical cycles of reform associated with the school system, similar, perhaps, to the reforming movements within the Catholic Church, of which some culminated in the founding of religious orders and others in the rise of new sects? What happens to children within the schools -- how are children transformed into pupils?

A knowledgeable and shrewd anthropologist can advance a number of hypotheses in respose to the questions we have just raised. He could, for instance, point to the differences beteeen the kind of age-grading that occurs among the children of hunting peoples who roam in small bands and that which occurs within our public schools, where children are associated with a narrow stratum of others of almost exactly the same calendrical age. From there he could argue about the differences that would develop because the first kind of children would have the opportunity to associate with others much

older than themselves and would have also the association with and responsibility for other children much younger than themselves; and, continuing the train of logic, he could argue as to the kinds of differences in personality that might ensue. Yet, much as we welcome such broad speculation, we do wish to insist that there is much about our schools that we don't know for such because investigators have not been looking -- they have administered tens of thousands of tests and conducted hundreds of interviews, but only a handful have looked systematically and diligently and sympathetically at all phases of the school in relationship to pupils, educators, and parents.

Just as we need to know more about how children are transformed into pupils, so we need to know more about how young persons (usually college students) are transformed into teachers. The research here has been limited and is mostly represented by that variety in which tests or other fixed schedules of questions are administered to samples of teacher trainees and veteran teachers (cf. Guba, Jackson, and Bidwell in Charters and Gage 1963: 271-286).) In accounting for the attitudes and conduct of veteran teachers, most critics have stressed the relationship between the teacher and the

school administration, the latter usually being bureaucratic, conservative, and timorous. However, we would also be inclined to suggest a Goffmanical posture of inquiry that would inquire as to the effects upon a person of having to be on public display before -- and in constant disciplinary control of -- a large audience of alien children for many hours per day. It is not, we would guess, the school administration per se that develops the teacher type, but the administrative requirement of facing and controling so large a body of youngsters. We are impressed by the fact that the problem of maintaining discipline in the classroom is foremost among the anxieties of the novice teacher, and also foremost among the demands made upon the teacher by his supervisors, and yet the literature of social research on the issue is so weak and so focussed on individual children as "disciplinary problems." We are also impressed by the fact that most novices do manage to maintain discipline in their classes, and that critical attention is usually directed only to the conspicuous failures of discipline, but that few scholars ask how the stunt is turned. Yet the question of how discipline is maintained throughout a school is, we suggest, a paradigm for the question of how order is maintained in civil society.

The School and the Great Tradition

To propose the foregoing questions -- how do children become pupils? how do young people become teachers? how is discipline maintained within the schoolroom? -- is to declare that the cross-cultural comparisons that anthropologists have conventionally attempted are limited in their relevance to formal education. By comparing the experiences of the contemporary schoolchild in the Bronx with that of a juvenile in New Guinea thirty years ago, we can say something significant about the personality development of the child, but we are in limbo so far as concerns much that is significant about formal education. As much is evident in terms of the content of the readers and textbooks on anthropology and education produced but a generation ago. The authors are well qualified, their essays are frequently of intrinsic interest, but their pertinence to the contemporary educational drama is negligible. For these anthropologists, trying to be culturally relativistic, defined "educational practices" in broad terms. Viewing cultures as separate and distinct entities that could be compared as independent individuals, they conceived of each as having its own system of child-rearing and, therefore, of education. Such a procedure did have and still has some uses, but it cannot hope to characterize the contemporary sit-

uation where education is of the order of an international mission activity, being exported from the U. S. and other Western societies. Education in this sense is avowedly intended to decrease the isolation of other ("backward") societies and to alter drastically their cultural configurations, and in its aggressive impact, this education is similar to the spread of Christianity, Islam, Communism, or capitalistic business practices.

Indeed, the traditional anthropological procedure was not even accurate for the history of Western society or of other civilized societies. For the Western system of formal education is rooted in its Great Tradition (Redfield, 1956: chap. 3: Singer, 1960) and can only be understood on that basis. Great Traditions, it will be recalled, are borne by a literate corps of disciples, and they are in tension with the Little Traditions transmitted informally within the little community. Or, in the pithy language of Bharati (1963):

> What the missionary in a particular religion wants the less knowledgeable votaries to do, defines the "big tradition," and what he wants them to give up and to desist from in the future, defines the "little tradition" in any religious area.

Christianity has epitomized that tension, for on the one hand, there have been its dedicated disciples, oriented toward the millenial creed of its scriptures,

while, on the other hand, there have been the folk, who have required a religion which, through its values and symbols, expressed the unity and morality of the little community. The tension has been clearly visible in the U. S. churches, especially of the contemporary South: for, as its dedicated ministers affirm, the Christian message would require thorough desegration, since all men are brothers in Christ; yet, to the members of the local White community, the local church embodies their moral unity and necessarily excludes the Negroes as alien and profane. The school stands in a similar situation, for, on the one hand, it too, is a kind of local church, embodying the sacred values of the little community. Yet, on the other hand, the school is connected, organizationally and ideationally, with the greater society and with the Great Traditions of the West.

In their relationship to the contemporary and actual school systems, intellectual critics -- such as ourselves -- play somewhat the role of the fervent religious orders within the medieval church. The critics are painfully conscious of the true message; they are prepared to be tolerant of some of the little traditional beliefs, providing they can be incorporated within the body of dogma; but they are appalled at the heresy and corruption within the institutional church. They debate

theories of education with their fellows, as if these were theological creeds, and they are perturbed that the school as a reality bears so little a resemblance to the school as the gateway to salvation.

If we may be permitted to continue this metaphor, we would suggest that what social scientists, especially anthropologists, could now accomplish in their research upon education is a purification of the dogma. The world of today is in the midst of a vast expansion and elaboration of the system of formal education: more peoples are sending their children to school; and, once in school, more children are spending longer periods of their lives. This transformation is of such magnitude and abruptness as to deserve the label of <u>revolution</u>, and it appears quite comparable in scope to movements, such as the spread of Christianity in the ancient world, or to the Industrial Revolution. While both of these did become worldwide, in order to do so each has had to purify itself of much ideological dross. Christianity did not become really effective in Northern Europe until its populace had eliminated from the dogma many of the peculiarities distinctive to the Mediterranean world and reformulated it in terms of their own ethnic traditions. The Industrial Revolution did not begin to permeate many areas of the world, until its dogma of

Manchester Liberalism was dismembered and replaced by local or nativistic creeds disguising themselves behind the flexible vocabularies of nationalism and socialism. Now, we should like to suggest that our U. S. educational system is similarly loaded with ideological irrelevancies that make it unsuited to other countries (cf. Thomas, 1966:72-74) and have made it clearly unsuited to our own ethnic and lower-class populations. We would hazard that the unsuitability in other countries is, at present disguised by the outpourings of financial and moral assistance fromthe West coupled with the native willingness to accept our institutional complexes in the dizzy hope of becoming as prosperous and powerful as the U. S. In about a decade, the twin impetus should have given out, and anthropologists may be in a position to observe some interesting attempts to reshape the educational structure. More than this, it should be possible for anthropologists to be of marked assistance in the reshaping and purification of education, providing that they are astute, critical, begin their work in the near future, and discard the restrictive blinders of irrelevant of system-biased research as we noted earlier.

Let us give an example of an ideological tenet that, as we have indicated, hampers the adjustment of some peoples to the Western system of formal education. U. S.

and Western schools, generally, have been organized about the notion of individual achievement with the reward of personal advancement and benefit. Looking historically and comparatively, we believe it can be argued that this tenet may not be essential and may even be somewhat of a hindrance, unless suitably modified. Great Traditions, generally, and Western scholarship. specifically, have been borne by associations of disciples, who have shared common goals and been subject to a common discipline. Anthropologists (or other social-scientists) would not accomplish what they do, wrestling with the hardships they must face, unless sustained by their association of compeers. There is individualistic competition, and it does stimulate to achievement, but it is a competition that is regulated by formal norms against deceit and plagarism and by informal norms of courtesy, fellowship, and comradehood. Whenever previously, the attempt has been made to disseminate widely Great Traditional knowledge throughout a population, it has been associated with a social movement having superpersonal goals. The Jews were among the first to accomplish widespread literacy, and it was strictly in a religious context, in order to bring about the salvation of Israel and the participation of the individual in that joyous event. With Protestantism a similar movement for literacy developed, more individual-

istic perhaps,but nonetheless set in the context of a social movement and communal aspirations. Today, in the U. S., we seem to be pushing the notion of individualistic competition within the framework of the school to an almost superhuman pitch. Yet, it is striking that real progress toward spreading literacy among lower-class or ethnic groups has so often occurred in the context of social movements: civil rights, the Black Muslims, and, as always, the evangelistic churches.

Another example of an ideological tenet has hampered the adjustment of some peoples to the system of formal education is, we believe, the notion that each child must be identified with a unique nuclear family and that the community encompassing the school is a community of nuclear families. As anthropologists, we are bound to ask whether as efficient an educational establishment could be fitted into a society with extended families and elaborate systems of kinship? Speaking from our observations among the Sioux (and our readings about other people, or even about the Hutterites and Amish), this is no idle question. So much of the procedures of the systems of schooling and welfare and public health are geared to the assumption that each child must be part of an intact nuclear family or else he is a neglected child, and the power of the state and the wealth of its

agencies is thereby used to disrupt the extended family and cement the nuclear. In the case of the American Indian, it is not yet too late to ask whether we should be doing this, and we may also bear in mind that many more peoples of the world are and will be increasingly involved with this issue.

The School and the Little Tradition

Because researchers have focussed on curricularly given tasks (cf. section 2 above) and critics have focussed on Great Traditional knowledge, no one has been looking systematically at the impact of formal educational institutions on little traditional processes of child rearing. Instead, there has been recourse to the concept of "cultural deprivation," which (like the Vacuum Ideology of Sioux educators) has enabled the theorists and administrators to ignore the culture of the impoverished and ethnic peoples, on the ground that it either scarcely exists or exists in such distorted form as best to be suppressed. Some social-scientists have been arguing as if these peoples are lacking -- linguistically, psychically, and culturally (Roach, 1965 and the retort by Hughes). Surely, here it is necessary to be concrete and ethnographic and to ask in specific detail about the experiences of the child in various contexts. Continuing our usage of the Great/Little Traditional dichotomy and tension, we would

suggest that the process of formal schooling is, to a large degree, the struggle to substitute one kind of tradition (or knowledge) for another within the mind of the child. Where, in a folk society, the child would have to master a great variety of particular bits of knowledge, concerning particular persons, topographic features, rites, skills, and so on, the archetypical urban school is oriented toward instilling a knowledge that is abstract, general, and in some sense, "rational," and, thereby, deracinated. In like manner, where in a folk society there is a great stress on the function of language to promote consensus and maintain the integrity of the community (Wright), in the urban middle-class world and its schools the stress is on language as a vehicle for imparting "rational" knowledge to strangers. Within the hierarchy of schools, it is the elite university with its graduate education that has epitomized this type of knowledge and language dialect, but the demand now is being made that the elementary school system participate even more intimately in this effort.

But knowledge or tradition does not exist in a vacuum; it is borne by individual human beings, and the demand that is being made on the schools to rationalize their curricula even further is, also, a demand that they produce a certain variety of human being -- abstract,

theoretical, rational, and, hence, deracinated -- the academic man writ large. But we are sufficiently disenchanted with our colleagues, and with the middle class of the U. S., to ask that researchers and critics examine the issue. In making the school more efficient in its transmission of formal knowledge, to what extent will the reformers be helping to create human beings who are more thoroughly deracinated and dehumanized? Conversely, to what extent are the current, so-called "inefficiencies" and stupidities of the school system really a blessing or a source of hope, because it is in these interstices (and irrationalities) that the child still has some chance of developing as a human being? We can, here, even ask about the Little Traditions of the school, the lore and experience that is transmitted informally among pupils, between teacher and pupils (and vice versa), within the school system. How much of what it means to be a man does a boy learn from his schoolmates (rather than from the curricular content of the school)? As reforms eat away at irrationalities and inefficiencies of the school, will they likewise reduce even further the opportunity to observe and experience the meaning of manliness? The skeptical reader may counter that we are here indulging in ethnographic nostalgia, and to be frank we are recalling the youthful Sioux, and their fine personal sensibility, the

BRILLIANCE
of their singing, the virility of their dancing, their exuberant vitality. Last summer, we were examining Head Start programs operated for Indian children, and we vividly recall one occasion in which we stepped from a powwow, that was distinguished by the most exciting singing and dancing, into a classroom where some well-meaning teacher was leading children through the familiar, dreary, off-tune rendition of a mursery song. Later, members of this staff were to talk with us about what they were doing for these "culturally deprived" children.

As we look at the youth of the contemporary U. S., we are not impressed by the success of our system of education and training. So many of our young men can perform well on the national tests of achievement and yet they lack the pride and self-confidence in their manliness. We recognize full well that to an audience of anthropologists and intellectuals, these criticisms may seem overly familiar. Yet, we think someone has to raise these questions, as <u>research</u> questions, and we think that this is part of our task as intellectuals and anthropologists, because otherwise all of us tend to concentrate so exclusively on the issue of educational tasks -- how the schools can teach better, faster, and more: how can kids be taught Russian at three, calculus at four, and nuclear physics at five -- and neglect to ask a far more important question:

what is happening to our children as human beings?

Let us summarize by using an economic model. Theoretically, it would be possible to isolate children in an environment free of all stimulation. Such environments, we would surmise, are pretty rare and would exist only in the most misguided and understaffed institutions. Given an actual environment, whether it be Harlem, Pine Ridge, or Summerfield, children will be experiencing and learning. If they are part of a folk society, they will be learning a folk culture. If they are part of the general U. S. middle-class, they will be learning its culture, and, if this latter, they will be better fitted for early achievement in school. For example, the child reared among the middle-class may acquire a larger vocabulary than the child reared in the slum or the reservation. Yet, while the size of vocabulary if predictive of early scholastic achievement, it is not a statement of linguistic or social maturity; for, as but one illustration, consider that some people of a modest vocabulary can be far more eloquent than scholars whose vocabulary is huge. What the child experiences in home and school is but a selection from a vast possible range, so that in economic terms, if the child is having one kind of experience, then he cannot be having another. If he is

learning calculus, then he is not simultaneously learning to dance, powwow style. We are suggesting that most intellectuals, including anthropologists, are so sold on the value of children learning calculus, that they have forgotten about the value of dancing, and that they are made so irate by the diction of incompetent educators who prate about the value of learning to play <u>with</u> others, that they have forgotten the intimate relationship between play and freedom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bell, Robert R.
1962 The sociology of education: a sourcebook. Nomewood, Ill., Dorsey Press.

Bharati, A.
1963 Eclectic patterns in Indian pilgrimage. Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco. Dittoed.

Brotz, Howard
1961 Functionalism and dynamic analysis. European Journal of Sociology (Archives Européenes de Sociologie) 2:170-179.

Charters, W. W., Jr. and N. L. Gage
1963 Readings in the social psychology of education. Boston, Allyn & Bacon.

Friedenberg, Edgar Z.
1965 Coming of age in America: growth and acquiesence. New York, Random House.

Gans, Herbert J.
1965 The urban villagers: group and class in the life of Italian-Americans. New York, Free Press.

Goffman, Irving
1959 The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, Doubleday Anchor.

Guba, Egon G., Philip W. Jackson, and Charles E. Bidwell
1963 Occupational choice and the teaching career in Readings in the social psychology of education. W. W. Charters and N. L. Gage, eds., pp. 271-286. Reprinted, Educational Research Bulletin (1959) 38:1-12, 27.

Halsey, A. H., Jean Floud, and C. Arnold Anderson
1961 Education, economy, and society, New York, Free Press.

Havighurst, Robert J. et al.
1962 growing up in River City. New York, John Wiley.

Henry, Jules
1963 Culture against man. New York, Random House.

Hollingshead, A. B.
1949 Elmtown's youth. New York, John Wiley.

Hughes, Everett Cherrington
1963 French Canada in transition. Chicago, University of Chicago, Phoenix Books, p 139.

Hughes, Everett Cherrington
1965 Comment on "Sociological analysis and poverty" by J.L. Roach. American Journal of Sociology 71:75-76.

Redfield, Robert
1956 Peasant society and culture. Chicago, Phoenix Books (P 53), University of Chicago Press.

Roach, Jack L.
1965 Sociological analysis and poverty. American Journal of Sociology 71:68-75, 76-77.

Singer, Milton
1960 The great tradition of Hinduism in the city of Madras. In Anthropology of folk religions, Charles Leslie, ed. New York, Vintage Books (V 105), Random House. (Reprinted from Journal of American Folklore 71:347-388.)

Spindler, George D.
1963 Education and culture: anthropological approaches. New York, Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Thomas, Elizabeth Marshall
1966 Warrior herdsmen. London, Secker & Warburg.

Vidich, Arthur J. and Joseph Bensman
1960 Small town in mass society. New York, Doubleday Anchor.

_____, _____, and Maurice R. Stein
1964 Reflections on community studies. New York, John Wiley.

Waller, Willard
1965 The sociology of teaching. New York, John Wiley, Science Editions.

Warner, William Lloyd
1949 Democracy in Jonesville: a study of quality and inequality. New York, Harper & Bros.

Withers, Carol
1945 Plainville by James West (pseud.). New York, Columbia University.

Wolcott, Harry F.
1965 A Kwakiutl village and its school: cultural barriers to classroom performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Stanford University.

Wright, Rolland
The urban man.

Wylie, Laurence
1964 Village in the Vauclose. New York, Harper & Row, Colophon Books CN 24.

NOTES

1. Since we do not have occasion later in our text to refer to some of the outstanding studies of contemporary schools, we would like here to note that Jules Henry (1963) and a number of researchers affiliated with the Bank Street College of Education -- notably, Donald Horton, Zachary Gussow, and Eleanor Leacock -- have been excellent and diligent observers of the school system. We should mention, as well, Edgar Z. Friedenberg (1965), who uses questionnaire schedules to rationalize his studies and essays, but whose shrewd observations of contemporary schools burst through his attempts to perform a mechanical analysis of his formal data.

WAX SESSION - SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Much of the discussion that followed Wax's presentation centered on the concepts of the culture of poverty and cultural deprivation. The first speaker compared education among the urban poor with that of the Sioux. Among the parallels she noted was the enthnocentrism of middle class teachers, particularly as reflected in the vacuum ideology. Educator's conceptualizations of children go from very gross descriptions to more sophisticated views of the poor as youngsters who require a "head start" because they are from a deprived environment. This view is ludicrous when one considers that upper income youngsters have been getting pre-school nursery education for a long time, as has been the case in many European countries. Yet when the United States wishes to extend school to an earlier age we wrap it up in an ideology that says we must get children away from their families in order to prepare them to learn.

Another parallel is found in parent-teacher conflict and the views they hold of each other. From the teachers' viewpoint the parents are pulling the children down while the school tries to pull them up from the private world to the public world. There is a clash between educators in terms of what they want to do and parents, particularly as regards their perception of the system. Traditionally school people see parents as problems: they won't cooperate, they won't come to school when you want them, and

so forth. What really happens is that school people call parents in on their terms and don't communicate well with parents.

The ideology of deprivation and the conflicts it gives rise to was exemplified inthe following anecdote. One New York City principal tried to orient his teachers to help them understand and aid their Negro students, however, what he communicated to his staff was a serious SERIES of cliches about the difficulties such children have as a result of their environment. He pointed to the noisy home atmosphere, the lack of encouragement and motivation, fatherless families, the absence of communication between parent and child, poor nutrition and the like. In fact, what he was saying was that you cannot expect children of these backgrounds to perform as other youngsters. When parents learned of this they became furious and demanded an apology. The parents were concerned that such a negative view on the part of teachers would prevent their children from getting exposure to the larger culture and from acquiring needed skills. A vacuum ideology interfers with this and sets up a block between teacher and student.

Developing this idea further another speaker pointed out that the concepts of poverty and/or cultural deprivation merely serves to support the present power structure and gives it an intellectual stamp of approval. What we are in fact saying is that our society maintains a

cultural pluralism in which there are people who are eligible for privilege and people who are ineligible. This is one of the definitions of social stratification. In American society there is a subculture or series of subcultures who have no access to privilege. One of the things that Negroes are objecting to is that they don't wish to be confined to the subculture to which they are relegated. It is not a question of technique, of what you teach or how you teach it; rather we are dealing with a total system which is using various mechanism to maintain itself. Historically in American society the only way to move from one subculture to another was through the educational system. One of the ways in which we are keeping people out, and we have a vested interest in keeping them out, is by giving intellectual respectability to the concept of cultural deprivation. Accredited sociologists and quasi sociologists like Moynihan are in fact saying it is not society that is keeping people out but rather it is their culture.

Some disagreement was voiced with the above statement. One speaker suggested that where the older agrarian society had a limited number of status positions with limited access the contemporary system is an expansive one in which there are innumerable positions open to those of demonstrable capability. Older views of social class are no longer applicable. Class today has a new meaning--a casualty of the system. We must open up education to people, not todestroy their culture but to give them needed skills.

In reply to this it was suggested that we are just beginning to approach a closed class system. We pay lip service to closing the gap but all we do is widen it. Thus in the Job Corps program we are teaching skills such as typing which are about to become obsolete.

Another speaker voted that while there are negative aspects to the recent social science interest in poverty in terms of the conceptual framework that has been developed there is also a positive contribution in that we are now calling attention to the fact that our schools have failed to enable the slum child to move into the public world.

One speaker suggested that the argument of self-perpetuation was treacherous in that it suggests that the system wishes to sustain itself. Perhaps what we are really saying is that the best laid plans go awry. There is considerable evidence that the system does not wish to perpetuate itself but that we do not know enough to know what to do to change it. The same participant noted that while half the social science world is talking about cultural deprivation the other half is talking about the culture of the poor. This is not really a dialogue. Both statements are true: the poor have a culture, the poor are culturally deprived. But this istoo gross and obscures more than it reveals. The question is how to avoid getting "hung up" on this issue; how do we devise strategies for

dealing with these problems. One suggestion might be to equalize the background of children in heterogenous situations by providing study units dealing with culture with which none of the children are familiar.

It was suggested that there was a basic difference between the Sioux and the urban poor in that the Sioux represent a subculture whereas the urban poor represent a variant of American culture. The value systems such children express are American values and these are the same values that are found in private boarding schools, small country schools and the like. What worked in urban areas in the past worked because we were dealing with immigrant children who were strangers to American culture and who had to learn that culture. Now we are dealing with people who share the same values. We can't say to children of the poor you are strangers to American culture.

Some participants voiced agreement with this view, One speaker noted that the problem is not one of the poor having a different culture but rather that they lack the instrumental means to live by the values they do have. He suggested that we need to concentrate on how to provide these instruments. However, others disagreed. A diversity of opinions were in fact expressed on whether or not the poor can be said to share American culture. Some participants felt that they did not and pointed to studies such as

Moynihan's which stress the cultural heterogenity of American society; others felt that the poor shared in this culture but were responding to the recognition that they had little opportunity to live by its dominant values.

In reply to this concern over the conflicting concepts of the culture of poverty, and deprivation, Wax suggested that there might be another way of looking at this. What we have are traditions of folk people in an urban context, such as Southern Negro migrants, or folk peoples like the Sioux. The particular subculture they have can be compared to what the school is trying to do on the one hand, and both can be compared to what we as intellectuals would like to have our schools do on the other. These are three different things. What one views are deprivation depends on the positive or negative values given to the folk tradition of the child. Perhaps culture is a poor concept to use here. Are the psychological damages of slum life cultural? It is part of a tradition, every child experiences certain phenomena of slum life, but it is not passed as culture.

Much of the discussion dealt not only with the issue of culture and cultural deprivation but also some with given to the question of whether or not it was desirable to attempt to turn the poor into middle class citizens. It was suggested that whether we take the position that the poor have a separate culture or whether we argue that

they lack the instrumental means to achieve middle class life, implicit throughout this discussion is the idea that we must make these people middle class. He objected to this aim and argued that middle class culture is in many ways dehumanizing. As expressed in our schools middle class culture represses many things: sensitivity, rich interpersonal relations and the like. Therefore he urged that we think of the kinds of human beings we want to see people become and not simply assume that our task is to help the lower class become middle class.

In much the same vein Wax stated that while he does not wish to isolate and preserve any group in the population he likewise does not wish to uncritically accept what our society does. While he recognizes that many lower class people want to move into the middle class and are unhappy about their position in American society he feels that many middle class people are likewise extremely unhappy. Consequently, we should not be the passive tools by which lower class individuals are turned into sterile middle class people.

In contrast to this view some participants argued that if we wish to bring the poor into full participation in American society it is necessary that they learn the behaviors and skills that are acceptable. These are middle class patterns. While there may be many things wrong with middle class culture the failure to help children acquire these skills and behavior patterns automatically relegates them to a low status position.

Turning to the question of teacher-student relations from the point of view of the cultural backgrounds of children, it was pointed out that few teachers have an awareness of this background. The group then considered some of the reasons for this. One problem is that teachers have no preparation for understanding or seeing the environment from which the children come. Anthropology might help here in that there is a need to train teachers in how to look so that they may better understand the environment, values and richness of the child's culture. Such an approach is being used by one participant at his school. Another reason for the vacuum ideology is the conscious or unconscious learning theory which is prevalent in American education. Teachers assume that the child comes in empty and must be filled with facts. This view is found not only on reservations and in slum schools but throughout the United States. It was suggested that anthropologists could help by providing a more acceptable learning theory. Perhaps the induction method suggested by Malcolm Collier in the morning session has relevance here. Finally it was noted that on some Indian reservations there is not only a failure to see but a denial of Indian culture on the part of teachers who disvalue this culture.

In connection with this point it was noted that we need to recognize that both learning and unlearning goes on in the schools. One of the problems of dealing

with the children of poverty is that much of what they have learned is unacceptable to the school. The school expects the child unlearn this. Thus at the same time that the teacher is trying to teach the child she is also correcting him. From the child's point of view he receives as much punishment in having to unlearn as he receives reward. The teacher has not been taught to deal with the question of unlearning; she has not been taught to deal with children coming from a half a dozen different subcultures - Puerto Rican, Negro, Southern Negro and the like; rather she has been taught to treat a class of students as if they had a common background. Lacking the time or training to inquire into the backgrounds of these children and given the fact that she is limited in the kinds of questions she is permitted to ask a child she cannot obtain the necessary knowledge even if she wished to.

But if one child must unlearn while others learn there is something wrong with American education. The quality of education should be such that everyone has a chance to learn within his limits. Education must be adapted to the learning culture of the child whatever that culture is.

In connection with this it was suggested that it is necessary to let the child draw on the strengths of his culture. This means that teachers must come to understand the values of the culture and use them. The culture of the poor can be very rich. As an example the speaker cited the

winning essay in an American Legion contest on "Why I Want to go to the Country for the Summer". One winner of the contest wrote instead on "Why I Wouldn't be Caught Dead in the Country" pointing to the joys of Houston Street. The speaker suggested that this essay showed the richness of urban lower class life.

Another speaker cautioned about the dangers of trying to change the culture of American Indians or urban poor. He cited the psychological dislocations that occur when you dissect a personality out of his cultural milieu. In order to preserve personality integration we must deal with the culture of these children as it is.

One participant took issue with a number of these views. She suggested that perhaps we are romanticizing the culture of the urban poor and of American Indians. These are not integrated cultures providing a meaningful way of life for people; they are broken cultures representing varient adjustments to the power structure of our society. The spontaneity and rich interpersonal relations we claim to see exemplified are counterbalanced by much restraint in some relationships, particularly those with more powerful segments of our society.

Not only is our view idealized by any attempt to perpetuate the "culture" of these people, if indeed it is a culture, necessarily means perpetuation of their status position in American Society. Full participation and accept-

ance requires the acquisition of skills, skills which involve behavior patterns as much as technical proficiency; indeed that is part of what Green spoke to this morning in describing the con game. It is naive to assume that we are going to immediately change this. We must opt either to perpetuate the stratification system in order to preserve the "folk" culture or to train students in middle class behaviors. Whether such training necessarily involves major shifts in values or merely shifts in cognition is a moot point. Perhaps one can acquire new cognitive frameworks and learn different patterns of behavior while holding to older motivations and values. The type of behavioral analyses offered by Goffman and Wallace suggest this as a possibility. If so, feared personality dislocation need not necessarily occur.

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN STUDYING THE CULTURE OF SCHOOLS

ELEANOR LEACOCK

To study schools from the viewpoint of culture, with its relativistic and holistic implications, brings one head on against a fundamental methodological dilema. The need for evaluation and comparison of "better" and "worse" teaching and learning situations calls for codification and quantification of data. However, to the extent that one attempts to quantify, one violates the complexity, hence the reality, of the totality being compared. There has been a recent tendency in the social sciences to go overboard on quantification as virtually synonymous with scientific method. It is too often forgotten than quantification is secondary to detailed, intensive description and analysis of single entities. After all, it is such analysis that yields the basic materials with which science builds.

Quantification can be no more than a short-cut for making generalizations and comparisons, or for isolating consistent relationships. Although it can demonstrate the frequency of presumed correlations, or give clues as to which of them may be more significant, it cannot of itself define cause and effect -- it is not itself analysis. Yet a highly quantitative orientation has characterized most past research on the teaching process. I see the increasing interest in school "culture", as evidenced by this conference, as a reaction to the inconclusiveness of this research, and

as a response to the need to deal more effectively with the complexity of schools and classrooms.

I do not feel we should be defensive about the use of traditional anthropological field methods for work in the schools. Contrary to the position taken by Dr. Gussow this morning, I think Jules Henry has done an excellent job documenting certain aspects of classroom life. He does not tell the whole story, but this no one field worker is expected to do. Henry was interested in conformity and docility, and described processes whereby they are transmitted to school children. What we need is a great many such "field trips," undertaken in a wide range of schools, and with a variety of foci, to give us the wealth of descriptive material on classroom processes necessary for developing generalizations about formal educationsl techniques and their results. To those who would continue to argue for more rigorous methods at the present stage of research, let me call attention to Anderson's review of studies on "authorization" and "democratic" teacher behavior. For virtually two decades, studies employed the most exacting methods, often experimental, to explore the effects of those two styles, according to Anderson, yet "they have not led to consistent or easily interpretable results." He attributes this in large part to the narrow conceptualization of teacher behavior involved, and writes, "When a satisfactory body of knowledge about learning in

social situations is available, it will then be possible to describe the behaviors which a teacher can exhibit to achieve a given learning outcome."[1]

1. Anderson, Richard C., "Learning in Discussions: A resume of the Authoritarian-Democratic Studes. Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 29, No. 3, Summer, 1959, p. 212.

In the research I am about to describe, however, our charge was both to study the complex total, "social psychological processes in the classroom,"[2] and to evaluate and compare classrooms, with a view to drawing implications for the improvement of teacher training. Thus we were in no position to adopt the anthropologist's field work approach, but had to make compromises between it and more abbreviated methods of data collection and analysis. In short, we were faced constantly with the dilema I have been discussing -- how to study an individual classroom in all its complexity and compare it with another -- and how to assess the typicality of either, or the relevance of the comparison.

2. The Study of Social Psychological Processes in the Classroom was conducted as part of the Schools and Mental Health project at the Bank Street College of Education, a project sponsored and supported by the National Institute of Mental Health.

We based our selection of classrooms to be studied on the premise that the general character of a school -- its "culture", so to speak -- would be more relevant to understanding what children were learning in any given classroom

than the personality of the individual teacher. Focusing on an individual teacher contradicts the simple fact that children will continue to learn -- or not learn -- from, or, perhaps, in spite of, a succession of different teachers in the same school: and children in one school will, as a group, consistently learn more, the same, or less than children in another. We know a fair amount about the way teachers are both selected and select themselves for schools where they "fit." If the fit is not good, a teacher either learns to adjust, and conforms to accepted school practices to some acceptable extent, or leaves. Thus continuities develop in the culture of individual schools, and teachers, whatever their personality differences (and in spite of always notable and interesting idividual exceptions), develop remarkably similar attitudes towards how to work with a given group of children.

To select our sample classrooms, therefore, we started with schools, and then took a "middle" second and fifth grade in each ("homogeneous grouping" being the norm in the New York City). The selection of the schools themselves was based on the further premise that the most significant variable would be social-economic backgrounds of the children served. Since the American educational system is the socializing institution second only to the family (if it is not equal to it), it perforce plays an active part in training children for appropriate roles according to the primary

social-economic variables in our society, class and race. Hence the schools chosen were: middle income Negro, middle income White, lower income Negro, lower income White.

Attempting to equate Negro and white schools for income level posed something of a problem. We found free lunch data to be the best available up-to-date indication of income, since neighborhood transformation with the building of large low or middle income projects, or "luxury" residential units, can so quickly render census data inaccurate. We could not select among the higher income white schools, or the lower income Negro schools, since the inequality that pervades our society means that there would be no counterpart in the other group. The Harlem schools, without exception, had a percentage of free-lunch children so far higher than any all-white school, that we chose a Negro school in a relatively stable working class neighborhood in the Bedford Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn. Similarly, many white schools, such as those on New York's East Side showed incomes so out of reach for schools in the one Negro middle-income neighborhood in New York City, that we selected a white school in a rather modest neighborhood of Queens. These are important considerations in the final evaluation of our material.

The schools thus chosen showed all the differences in overall size, degree of overcrowding, achievement level of pupils, and so forth, that have been well documented in recent years, most notably in Patricia Sexton's "Education

and Income."[1] There has been a great deal of buck-passing between the community and

1. Viking Press, New York, 1961

the school as to whether it is the neighborhood and family, or the educational system which is primarily, responsible for this inequity. Certainly the interplay between the two is clear. However, the active role of the school in socializing children for their class and race roles is also clear. Different expectations for different groups of children are built into the entire school system, and are consistently conveyed to them. Therefore we considered Merton's "self-fulfilling prophecy" as an important concept to keep in mind when formulating our research plans, and we were interested to explore in detail its enactment in the classroom.

Another central theoretical concern was to avoid the erroneous implication that culture is a mold, casting all children in the same impression. We wished to study the means whereby, in a classroom, as in any other social situation, a variety of alternative roles are structured for the children. Children fill them according to their own predispositions and prior history in the school, and according to how they are seen by the teacher. Some of this operates at a relatively obvious level; A series of roles, the "fast" and "slow" children, compliant and rebellious children, withdrawn children, and so on, are accepted and expected by a teacher, who assesses the types of children

in a classroom during the opening days of the school term. Some children will already have been discussed with previous teachers, and will have reputations as bright, dull, helpful, naughty. Classroom gradiants will vary, so that a child identified as "bad" in one group might be closer to the normative expectation in another, and a much more rebellious child will play the role of the "really bad" boy or girl.

We were particularly interested to see how the constellations of roles varied from classroom to classroom, and what contrasts there were in the association of behaviors, attitudes, and expectations. For example, is it true that the quick, capable and highly achievement-oriented child is more likely to be teacher-favored as well as over-favored in a middle income school than in a lower income school? Is there, as a result, more concordance, less conflict, between school achievement and other goals? We did find suggestions of this, by the way, although the converse did not automatically follow. It was not the most rebellious children who were peer-favored in the lower income schools, but seemed rather to be those whose rebelliousness wasmore under control. How such differences are built into classroom structure through a teacher's management techniques as well as attitudes towards and goals for the children, was a central focus of our study.

In comparing classrooms along such lines, we did

not conceive our aim to be "proving" one or another proposition. Our small sample size, in addition to the considerations discussed above, would rule this out. We considered our "findings" to afford clarification of the way the total "enculturation" or "socialization" function of the classroom affects its function of "educating" in the specific sense. We were concerned to relate classroom differences to what we know about the general conditions and expectations for major groupings in our society, so that the implications for educational innovation drawn from comparisons and evaluations would have a broad and realistic basis.

* * *

Our data collection procedures included teacher and child interviews, as well as classroom observations. In each case, however, we were able to keep the material reasonably limited and focused. The teacher was interviewed twice, once before and once after the observations, and in the second interview she[1] was asked whether she had any comments to make about the observation sessions. The schedule was direct and straightforward, and did not employ the personality-type questions of psychologically oriented questionnaires. We respected the fact that teachers have goals they are trying to attain, with which we should be familiar, and focused the interview on teaching aims and

1. All of the teachers were women.

methods. We did, however, concern ourselves with teacher values as the more meaningful way to handle significant material which is generally included in the category, "personality." Several questions about different kinds of children in the classroom were included in the interview, and during the second session, the teacher was asked about any children who had not been mentioned during the first. The objective was to have some material on every child in the classroom, and on this we based a rather detailed and intensive analysis of the teachers convert, as well as overt, attitudes towards the children and expectations for them.

The child interview was also straightforward, although quite short. We asked questions like: What kinds of things do children do that the teacher likes? that she dislikes? What does she do when she likes, dislikes something? What do the children learn at school, like at school? What would they miss if they did not go? (Here sometimes getting the answer from lower income children,"lunch.") We asked about school in relation to future goals. The children's stated occupational goals by and large reflected the occupational levels of their parents, although many of the lower income children spoke of going to college, a well-defined goal for our society as a whole. However, their understanding of the steps toward college, and the precise relation between it and occupational preparation was not clear

We also asked some sociometric questions, in order to examine teacher-favored versus peer-favored children in relation to role definitions.

Our observations were fairly short -- three periods of an hour and a half each. Yet the depth and richness of the material was such that it seemed sufficient for carrying further the questions we were asking. A number of studies have demonstrated a high reliability for the analysis of teacher performance from relatively short periods of classroom observation. Withall found that the characteristic style of a teacher's statements taken in any two-hour period matched that drawn from much longer periods.[1]

1. Withall, J., Assessment of the Social-Emotional Climates Experienced by a Group of Seventh-Graders as they Moved from Class to Class, in Coladarci, A.P., ed., Educational Psychology, New York, Dryden, 1955, pp. 193-205.

Beecher states that scores made after two observations of teacher performance, as broken down into many detailed dimensions, were not substantially revised in his study after a third observation period.[2] Similarly, in the School

2. Beecher, D.E., The Evaluation of Teaching, Syracuse University Press, 1949.

Experience Study now being completed at the Bank Street College of Education, the classroom resumes written after the first few visits were tremendously amplified and deepened, but not contradicted by subsequent observations. As for teachers showing only their best behavior to the

observers, and not "hollaring" at the children as loudly as the child interviews might indicate, this did not seriously affect the analysis of their basic style. Indeed, the very fact that they might be exaggerating what they felt to be most desirable behavior, even brought out contrasts more sharply.

Two observers worked together in a classroom, one concentrating on the teacher, one on the students. The two records were than put together, affording highly detailed running accounts of classroom life. Each observer had a seating plan, so that all teacher statements about or to every individual child could be recorded. It was central to our design, to see how a teacher differentially allocated her rewards or reprimands, and to see how different children were experienced different aspects of both her teaching and management style. We also attempted to get in as much detail as possible particularly value-laden incidents, and clearly goal-defining statements or directives. For the sake of comparison, the observers also rated the teacher, after leaving the classroom, along certain commonly defined dimensions, such as permissive-strict, consistent-erratic, supportive-undermining, and so forth. However, these were little used in the subsequent analysis.

The research team included people with teaching as well as research experience, and, for the analysis of teaching style, we drew in other teachers as well as teachers

In order to avoid the unhealthy results that accompany the bureaucratization of research, all team members participated in the study at all levels--the formulation of research design and techniques, the actual collections of data, and at least the preliminary analysis of materials.

* * * * * * * * * * *

In our analysis, we differentiated between the curriculum itself and the teacher's classroom management practices. Our observation periods were selected to cover at least one long session each of reading, mathematics and social studies in all classrooms. We tore the record apart in detail, rating and analysing the teacher's academic techniques along a number of dimensions, and the level, depth and breadth of curriculum materials. In examining classroom management, we dealt both with formal structural aspects, the stated rules and routines, and with informal or indirect aspects, that is, what the teacher responded to or ignored, and how, to whom, and for what she meted out approval and disapproval. In both instances, we examined both the objective material and the values it implied, the goals it set up for the children (either to accept or reject), and the expectations it communicated.

For example, we inquired into the value content of curriculum materials in relation to the children's background and general experiences.

After coding all questions, directives or statements the teacher addressed to an individual or to the class, we compared the number of those concerning the curriculum with those concerning behavior, to see what the relative importance of each was to the teacher. However, this relationship turned out to be less relevant to the value placed on learning than the total number of remarks concerning curriculum made by the teacher in a three-hour period, and the number per child in the classroom.

In developing methods of analysis, we attempted to work both with quantitative and "objective" measures and particularly significant observational materials (one could think of them as "key" incidents), without losing the explicit content of the latter. We collated profiles of each child in a classroom, including material on how he saw himself and how other children saw him, both in descriptive terms and as sociometrically favored or disfavored, as well as how the teacher saw him, and how he emerged in observational materials. We included a count of all teacher statements to the child in the observations, and whether positive, negative or neutral, as well as a scoring of her attitude towards him as revealed in her

interview. We arrived at the latter score by coding each teacher mention in her interview as either positive, negative or neutral - a rather complicated procedure, since a teacher can say something generally positive about a child, but with a derogatory inference, or something negative in a supportive or accepting way. The picture that emerged of what the teacher actually valued in the children, which could then be matched against the children's views of each other, was extremely rich. We subjected it to quantitative analysis, for clues on role constellations in the classroom, and also used it to fill in the picture of teacher values as developed through collated incidents and value-laden statements from the observational records. None of this was very neat, nor did we consider we had arrived at definite answers about the way to study classroom culture, but we did feel the attempt to combine "objective" and "descriptive" materials have proved valid and productive.

* * * * * * * *

The results of our research concurred generally with the plethora of critical material on our educational system. Although all of the teachers we observed were experienced and competent by public school standards, much of their teaching was extremely poor. Moreover, while better teachers were at least clear and organized in the

exposition of their material, their teaching was a one-way process. They had not mastered techniques for real involvement of the children in learning, and there was little understanding how to relate material to where children are at any given point. The Deweyan concepts which are employed to one extent or another in private, more successfully progressive schools (and now being rediscovered as "new" ideas in programs for educating lower income children) are obviously not made real to public school teachers in their training courses. It also became clear that Deweyan principles cannot be applied where a child's experiences and capacities are not respected.

The kind of findings on which I want to elaborate here, however, relate to the total socialization processes as it is enacted in the classroom. We observed some children who were learning in spite of poor teaching, and, in another school, others who were not learning because of poor teaching. What appeared crucial was the general expectation of the teacher for the children's performance, as school life actively reinforced out-of-school differences arising from the children's social position according to their class and race. The similarities between the second and fifth grades in the same school, and the contrasts among schools were so striking, and so in accord with what we know of class and race roles, that it appeared our classrooms had been selected on the basis of how well they paralleled social differences.

The middle income white classroom almost parodied the world of the much-discussed organization man, replete with its committees and commissions. In the classroom, initiative was encouraged and rewarded, but only to a certain degree, or along certain lines. It was fascinating to observe the point at which authority in the person of the teacher intervened, and the sensitivity (or "other directedness" with which the children looked to her for cues as to how far to go. Some examples, humorous, yet at the same time dismal, illustrate the relationship between teacher and children in this and other classrooms.

During the second grade spelling lesson, the children were spelling "fish," and the teacher asked how many liked fish. Scattered hands were raised, and the teacher pressed the point, saying, "Those who like fish, stand." At this, all but six stood, and the teacher said, "I'm sorry you are not all standing. I am sorry, since fish is good for you." At this, another child slowly and uncertainly shoved himself up from his seat, but one girl near the observers snapped her eyes resentfully. The teacher closed this part of the lesson by asking the children to list different kinds of fish for their homework. Later, when reminding them, she said, "With the fish, I hope you will list the fish I like. I will tell

tomorrow." There is a rising whisper in the class, "Tuna..."

A contrasting incident in the lower income all-Negro second grade shows the children's lack of interest in teacher preferences -- but in the content of an episode in which the teacher has summarily rejected a child's long and enthusiastic account of a personal experience. The lesson was on transportation, and the teacher asked if any children had been to the airport. Many raised their hands, and she called on a boy who gave a full account of watching various airplanes land and take off. The characteristic response of the above-mentioned teacher to such expositions was, "oh,how wonderful," or, "isn't that nice" (academically meaningless, perhaps, but at least accepting). However, in this case,the teacher responded not to the child, but to her own curiosity, with the implication that all was not quite right. "Who took you?" she asked, making no reference to the content of his talk. "Day care," he responded which ended the incident. Shortly thereafter, the teacher remarked to the children, "You know, I've never been on an airplane," and continued, after a stagey pause. "What is something Mrs. M.is going to do very soon? There was no response from the children.

Material such as this made us realize how over-simplified the assumption is that a major difficulty for lower class children in school is identification with its "middle class values," by comparison with middle class

children who identify readily. In classroom incidents like the above, one could observe the teacher directly negating a child's enthusiastic recounting of experience, and the children responding in kind. This was made all the more clear in this classroom, since the teacher was friendly and the atmosphere pleasant. Its main drawback was that it lacked real educational goals for the children. Indeed, this enabled it to be relaxed and amiable -- there were no real demands on the children to achieve. By the fifth grade in the same school, the children had become much more apathetic. They gave the impression of rather patiently sitting through the day. We came to understand that flatness and boredom are more characteristic of classrooms in Negro neighborhood schools than the jazzed up features deduced from the "blackboard jungle" stereotype.

The fifth grade teacher in the Negro lower income school stated discipline, not learning, or even "social adjustment," to be her primary aim for the children. When asked what she felt to be the main thing they should be getting out of school, she answered, "First of all discipline. They should know that when an older person talks to them or gives a command that they should respond; they should listen." Yet she was not authoritative as a person, but was instead friendly and accepting of the children, who were allowed considerable freedom in the classroom. Her conception of her

role, which paralleled the "boss" the children would be taking orders from in their adult life,was indicated by the classroom structure. When a child gave a report,it was she who questioned him. By contrast, the white middle income fifth grade had an elaborate committee and class leader structure. When a child reported, another child led the session and asked for questions and discussion from the floor.

The minimal educational goals in the lower income Negro fifth grade were further revealed when a count was made of all questions or responses about the curriculum that the teacher addressed to individual children. The number was markedly lower in this classroom than in any other, both absolutely, and relative to the number of children. Furthermore, the ratio of positive to negative responses by the teacher to children's work was one to one, while the lowest ratio in any other classroom was one to one. Usually it was one or two or three. This ratio is more than a simple function of whether an answer is correct. A wrong answer can evaluated "positively," with a remark like, "You're close to it," and a correct answer can be derogated. In the classroom we are discussing, a child put an arithmetic example on the board, writing the correct answer, "45." "45 what?" the teacher said. The child answered, "45 cents." "Show me that it's 45 cents,"

said the teacher. "It doesn't look like 45 cents to me. It just looks like 45." In and of itself, such a remark has little significance. As a recurrent type of statement, however, in conjunction with low goals for the children and little intellectual stimulation, it becomes part of a consistent and undermining trend.

The apathetic quality of the fifth grade Negro classroom was marked, and the level of the curriculum pitiful, yet the children responded eagerly when anything of interest occurred. A science planting session afforded an example of a promising lesson which ended in sheer frustration for one group. The teacher distributed seeds and the children filled their boxes, climbed to the top of the closet for the water pitcher, and rummaged in the teacher's desk for markers with independenceand enthusiasm. However, the teacher made no comment, led no discussion. This was a fifth grade, yet the standard of the "lesson" would not have met that of a good kindergarten. The teacher simply announced what each group had planted, then added, perhaps for the benefit of the observers, "Suppose Group Three puts their tray in the closet and sees what happens if there is no light." There were little cries, "In the closet?!" Some of the children had been taking detours from time to time to look at the table of stringy plants at the back of the room; they knew well what would happen. The teacher repeated, "We're going to

use Group Three's seeds as an experiment to see what lack of light will do," and this terminated the session. The children forlornly obeyed, but to speak of "experiment" was a mockery. For them this was nothing but punishment.

Classroom atmosphere in the middle income Negro school differed sharply from that which I have been describing, and along lines one might guess if one considered the differing social expectations for the two groups of children. That children in the middle income school were being groomed for heavy competition in a relatively hostile middle class world, which meant, as James Baldwin has commented, being the most scrubbed and polished group in our society. They were being asked to be better than best, more controlled than controlled. "Now you've had many compliments," the teacher said to the fifth grade, as they were getting on line, "but I think we need to stop once more and ask, is this the best we can do? However, the children were also being taught. We observed some of our best technicians in this school. I use the term "technician," because they were effective in getting across a specific body of material to the children, and in drilling them, in a consistent and businesslike manner. Their teaching was limited as far as real education is concerned.

When the "middle class" neighborhood of this school, with its single family houses set in small lawns, changed from

white to Negro, the principal had refused to allow the school to be categorized as "special service." She stated it would prejudice the children's chances for entrance into the better junior high classes. In order that academic standards would not slide, she had tightened the control and organization of her academic program. For instance a "single track" system for reading had been instituted. Each entire classroom read together, and at 11 o'clock promptly, children changed classrooms to read with others at their level. As a result of the principal's attitude, morale had remained good, and there had been no acceleration in the rate of teacher turnover. However, the rigidity of the classroom atmosphere was such that we wondered at the cost to the children's individualities. Yet the children were being effectively prepared to compete for positions in a specific and narrow social slot; they were being fitted for their social role.

The atmosphere in the lower income white classrooms was rather amiable, and, like the lower income Negro school, related to the lack of strong pressure on the children to achieve. Teaching standards were higher, however, and teachers more supportive. As a matter of fact, the school was developing a more "middle class character" during the period of our observations. A decision had been made to keep the neighborhood from

"going down hill", a middle-income project was being built, and the school district rezoned to segregate the growing Negro and Puerto Rican population). (We discovered that, inspite of the hue and cry about bussing, school districts are still largely zoned to segregate.)

I hope these brief remarks indicate the kinds of things we looked for, and the methods we used, in studying four schools that contrasted by class and race. One can speak of them as representing different "school cultures" only in a superficial or descriptive sense. What is in fact involved is the differential training of children for different positions <u>in a single integrated culture</u>. Thus it is naive to think it is only necessary to discover "correct" methods for teaching lower income children in order to improve their education. The total institutional structure of the school as it fills its socializing role must be examined for sources of change.

m

Leacock Session - Summary of Discussion

The discussion began with a consideration of methodology. It was pointed out that qualitative studies might have an advantage over quantitative ones on terms of communication. While much work has been done on the schools, there has been comparatively little feed back into the system, perhaps because quantification prevents this. Since ethnographic studies are of greater interest to teachers and the public in general, their use might heighten the possibility of communication of results to a wider audience.

It was also suggested that we need to take into account educators' desires for information, both as a matter of strategy, since this should aid in getting access to the school, and because it would be helpful. There has been much conscious planned change in the schools: team teaching is an attempt to change school culture by rearranging time, space and student group arrangements; curriculum innovation has touched almost every area of improvement; rating changes have occured and the like. Educators want information on what changes have been elicited by these inovations. If we bring into our research people from the National Association of Secondary Schools, principals, deans of schools of education and the like, and take into account their research needs and desires in our planning the problem of access to the schools would largely disappear.

But taking into account felt needs is only partly a matter of strategy. It was pointed out that if we approached schools as applied anthropologists one of the first things we would do would be to find out what the felt needs of the system are and begin our research from that point. But this has been largely ignored in the planning of the Culture of Schools Program. At this meeting we have been discussing what we should do, without asking what people in the system wish done. Such questions would not only help solve the problem of access, but might also keep us from falling flat on our face.

It was further pointed out that talking to school people would not only affect results, but might also influence what we looked for in our research. Thus, it is not merely a question of helping teachers improve, or of meeting their needs; rather, speaking to teachers in advance of research might help us identify the things that are going wrong in the schools and might deeply affect what we look at.

Furthermore, it was suggested that felt needs refers not just to the felt needs of the school but also the felt needs of some educators at the top of the hierarchy. There are more sophisticated people at this moment who know more of what is going on than the anthropologist does. They should be drawn into research planning.

In like vein, it was noted that there are many educators, principals, teachers, superintendents and the like who have had some anthropology. While they are not trained anthropologists,

they do have some idea of what the anthropologist looks for. People like this should be utilized. We are not in a position where we have to choose between someone who knows nothing of education and someone who knows nothing of anthropology. There are people who know a little of both. Why weren't such individuals invited to this conference? While they may be somewhat difficult to identify, many of the conference participants could put their fingers on people they have trained. It was suggested that such people be brought into the Culture of Schools Program and invited to future meetings.

A further suggestion concerned the use of teachers and former teachers in research as observers. While having been a teacher may blind one to some things, it is also possible that a former teacher might see some things in a situation that would escape those who had never taught. Perhaps college teachers might be used. One speaker noted that he had used teachers in this role and he found them to be excellent observers since they were there all the time. They could only do what they had been trained to do, look for a category or categories of events, but the materials they reported were rich. The limitation here was that there was no way of knowing what proportions of all events that might have been recorded were in fact recorded. It is useful to involve the teacher as observor, not so much in his own teaching but with reference to the youngsters.

The role of teacher as informant was also discussed. The same speaker pointed out that if you ask a teacher what his problems are he will tell you whatever he can. But what he can tell you is limited by what his theory permits. In one study teachers were interviewed about their problems at a time when they had just been through a Prescott child study program. They talked of school problems entirely in terms of social and emotional development and not at all of learning problems. This was all that they could see. This places one limitation on the information and research guides educators can give.

Leacock, drawing on her own research experience, offered some comments on access, the use of teachers as researchers, and on the communication of observations to educators. In her study, observers had access only to the better teachers since they were not permitted to observe problem classrooms. This, while frustrating, had some advantages as it permitted an assessment of good teaching in the different schools. As far as communication of findings to teachers, Leacock noted that time did not permit this. This was unfortunate since she felt that observations that were made would have been valuable to teachers in helping with their problems, and such aid would have been welcomed. Finally, her study did make use of teachers as researchers, particularly in teacher interviews. They related well to other teachers who seem to have enjoyed the interview and learned much from it.

A number of suggestions were offered concerning research personnel. In addition to the possibility of using teachers as researchers, it was suggested that foreign observers might be used. In particular, Japanese and Indian anthropologists as well as Negroes might be brought in by the Culture of Schools Program. Leacock noted that in her study rather than relying on the most easily available group of observers, white women, a real attempt was made to have a varied staff of classroom observors. Negroes as well as whites, men as well as women were used. This provided insights that might not otherwise have been available since such observors could more readily identify with the children and their perceptions were aided by this identification.

Sources of information and data collection were also discussed. One suggestion was to do an analysis of the language of educators. Such words as "self-discipline" and procedural terms like "progress report" which are used in teacher conversations are a valuable source of material about the culture of the schools. Thus, observation and analysis of coffee room conversation, planning meetings and the like should be undertaken. The same considerations apply to school documents which should be examined from this point of view.

The application of standard field techniques to the study of schools was also suggested. In particular, the use of biographies and auto-biographies was mentioned as well as

the need for a description and mapping of the physical characteristics of the environment. Leacock noted that in her study they had mapped classrooms and made note of the pictures on classroom walls which gave much useful material on values. She also did a demographic analysis of the school.

Another suggestion concerning technique centered on the use of the comparative method. It was pointed out that while the conference had discussed the possibility of comparisons of American schools with schools of other national cultures, nothing was said about the comparing of different levels of schools in the United States. The speaker noted that there seem to be differences in school culture at different levels. Thus, colleges show an extreme aggressiveness in intellectual activities which is absent at lower levels, perhaps because of the intellectual isolation of the pre-college teachers. Useful comparisons of school culture might be made of college and pre-college levels, of elementary, secondary and college culture.

A major focus of discussion which turned into something of a dialogue concerned the question of ideology vs. organizational form with particular change, the redeployment of people had no effect on achievement. Two examples were cited, a study he had done in Greenwich on team teaching and a recent and quite elaborate study done by Miriam Goldberg on homogenious or ability groupings in Queens. Both of these studies and countless others done since 1920 show that

organizational change has no effect on performance. Given this finding, several things emerge. First the continued attempts to bring about substantive change through organizational change are based on faith rather than empirical fact. Practically speaking it does not seem to matter what is done, if you believe in your prediction you may fulfill it regardless of what forms you employ. Second, this finding suggests that any attempt to bring about change must couple structural reorganization with something else, a change in educational intent. Perhaps ideology rather than structure is crucial to real substantive change.

The finding on homogenious groups was questioned by one participant who suggested that homogeneity, at least of lower class existance, does impede achievement. In response to this, the speaker elaborated on the Goldberg study which was done in a middle class area. Here homogenity was based on I.Q.'s, and social class was not a prominent factor. But the general character of the finding, that homogenious groups have no effects favorable or unfavorable on achievement has been made countless times. Abrahamson did it in New York. High school students were followed into college and the first two years of college grades were examined. It appeared that there were no differences which could be associated with whether or not they had attended honor classes, special academic high schools, regular schools and the like. Neither achievement tests nor grades show any relationship to ability grouping.

Miriam Goldberg couldn't even find any differences in attitudes towards school which correlated with such groups. There were some slight differences here and there but they were scattered through the data and made no particular sense.

The questioner then took issue with the idea that change of form does not change anything else. He suggested the reason the school is conservative is precisely because it has maintained the same form. To this, the first speaker replied that the reason the school is conservative is because if hasn't changed its intent. Citing an international study he had been involved in he noted that one of the findings was that at age 13 mass scores are homogenious across Western Europe and the United States. Numerous things seem to make no difference to the results. Thus, age of entrance into school which varies from 5 years in England, 6 years in most countries, 7 years in Sweden and Finland, etc., has no effect. By age 13, the responses are the same. In a pilot study where the samples were not described, similar findings were noted. Reading was homogenious, knowledge of general science was not quite homogenious, but that is ascribed to television, and mathematics were homogenious. Where scores varied 70% to 80% of the variance were explained by factors over which the school had no control, in particular, father's occupation explained almost all of this. This is a finding that is extremely unpopular and people reject it because of their faith in structural alterations. Nonetheless, it crops up time and again.

Given these factors several things seem to be true. One, a common sense observation, is that teachers should be permitted to choose the types of groups they wish to teach. This was done at the University of Chicago Lab School under the term "teachable group." Here the staff agreed to experiment with this and further agreed that all students in the school had to be selected by some instructor. Each teacher selected the children he felt he could teach. Presumably the brightest and most charming were chosen first, but when they got down to the problem children the teachers were forced by this system to say "I think I can work with that kind of a problem" or "I think I can work with that other kind of problem." Citing his own experience he pointed out that when he had taught he felt he could work more effectively with a child who acted out than with children who were withdrawn. Other teachers might make different choices. By asking teachers to choose they are in fact predicting that they can work with these types of youngsters and are committing themselves to working with them.

Second, he suggested that a school exists by virtue of its ideology and that a great deal of this ideology is expressed in academic content. Perhaps if we changed intent alone, it would not work. We need to couple organizational change with change in intent. But if you change everything else and not the ideology, the change is meaningless. Looking at the new

math, the new physics and other new programs as ideologies, it is apparent that they have a different conception of the student in mind--they want him to become an inquirer. In that sense you have changed the ideology. If, however, you believe the school exists to teach children how to obey rules and orders, that discipline is the main thing, you act according to that.

The importance of intent as a factor in achievement came out in a number of comments. Leacock noted that in one study of the various programs for deprived children they found that no matter what was done there was always some improvement, even if only a modest one. Thus, the Hawthorne effect. You go in to help the children and they respond immediately because what they usually live with is apathy. It was also noted that Clark claims that any educational experiment produces a two year gain in one year. It is the intent that matters, not the form of the change. Closely related with this is the importance of personalization of education. The development of materials for teaching anthropology has tried to take this into account. It is important for the child to be recognized and valued in the teacher's and in his own eyes for what he does with materials. This was the quality of the old activity units and teachers used to take much pride in them. While much was wrong with the old activity movement, particularly the random organization

of curriculum, it did introduce an experimental flavor into normal teaching. The unit was never the same from year to year and the children had to make it work. Thus there was excitement in the classroom. While no one is working much on such programs today, the ideas are still there to be recaptured. All it requires is a little thought on how to manage a classroom in such a way as to have a legitimate thing for everyone to do that contributes to the group experience. However, one speaker suggested this might work differently at various grade levels. It could work best during the early grades of elementary school, but the fourth to sixth grades are more subject matter oriented and children can participate less.

The group considered the usefulness of the concepts of culture vs. subcultures in dealing with the school's role in socialization and enculturation. This discussion began with a question to Leacock concerning her view of schools in which she treats them not as separate cultures, but as fitting the individual for participation in a culture. The speaker asked if perhaps the schools themselves could be viewed as subcultures. Moreover, she wished to know what cultural mold Leacock believed the children were being fitted for, metropolitan culture, continental United States culture, etc.

Leacock responded by stating that she has never gotten terribly interested in discussion of what is or isn't culture or subculture. Perhaps there has been too much emphasis on

"lower class culture" as a kind of monolithic separate entity. This is a part of the total culture in the sense of a total society with its various integrating mechanisms, its single value system and so forth. Obviously, different individuals are going to take different bits and pieces of it with some variations for groups of people who fit into different niches, roles, slots of one kind or another. But, these are not separate cultures in the extreme sense. What we see is an educational system which is one system. Within the total system people are being trained to fill different roles in the society and class and status differences are being perpetuated. This occurs even in "integrated" schools where you have fast and slow classes, a double track system, etc. Whether or not the term sub-culture should be used is a moot question, but Leacock tends not to use it. Moreover, the cultural concept is now being substituted for race as the explanation for group differences. The worst instance is the discussion of "Dregs" culture in a highly reputable book on social issues and education. Likewise a study done by a professor emeritus at Harvard reflects this approach. In a discussion of Negroes, Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans, he offers a terrible mixture of generalizations and stereotypes. It is almost better to say people are inferior than to say people have dregs culture or are culturally deprived. This is very genteel, and sounds reputable. It is therefore

harder to fight.

Another topic discussed by the group was the degree of communication among teachers. One speaker suggested that mapping might be useful to point out the degree of teacher to teacher contact. He felt that there was much isolation of the teacher in her classroom with very limited contact with other teachers within the school. As for teacher to teacher contact between schools it was suggested that this is almost non-existant and that schools within the same system are isolated from each other to an extraordinary degree.

This suggestion of isolation was corraborated by examples offered by another participant. He cited a study he knew of in which the researcher had engaged teachers as observors and sent them to other schools. These teachers became very excited because they saw for the first time a variety of education and educational approaches that they had never witnessed heretofore. Another illustration concerning teacher-teacher contact derived from a study with which the speaker himself was involved. Here the research concerned event sequences of student question-teacher response-and child reaction. For this study teachers were used as observors, but they insisted on being paired off so that the observor and observed worked with each other. Teachers seem to have objected to observation unless it was confined in this fashion.

Teacher contacts seem to differ somewhat in large and

small systems. In the larger school systems where there are 8 to 10 teachers the distribution of interaction may be wider but there are still one or two strong friendships that occupy most of a teacher's time outside the classroom.

It was suggested that children might be useful informants on such friendships. They always know about teacher friendships and how much a given teacher is apt to know about them from former teachers who are friends.

Another speaker noted that teacher contacts relate to their roles and to the degree to which facilities are available for meeting and contact within the school. There is segmentation along age, sex, departmental and specialty lines, tenure, etc., all of which affect teacher to teacher contact and conversation.

Apart from the frequency of teacher contact itself the content of discussion between teachers was commented upon. One speaker noted that in her experience teachers appear to have few ways of talking about teaching. When they discuss it at all it is generally in terms of youngsters who are great problems or great successes. Another speaker agreed and noted that this paralleled her own experience. In her research she encountered one teacher who tried to talk about what went on in her classroom to teachers with whom she was friendly but no one would listen. This went on all the time. If teachers do talk about what goes on in the classroom it's

generally in individual terms and never in terms of technique. Some teachers apparently do discuss technique but this seems confined to places where experimental programs are going on.

It was pointed out that there are several people interested in teacher contacts at Teachers' College and one sociologist has some material that is about to come out.

The session concluded with some comments on the usefulness of taking community opinion and/or professional opinion to determine which are the good and bad schools.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE COLLOQUIUM

ON THE CULTURE OF SCHOOLS

HELD AT

THE NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

JUNE 3-4, 1966

Introductory Remarks

Stanley Diamond

We began the Culture of Schools Program with the assumption that there is a permanent crisis in the techniques, the means and the goals of mass, or universal education. When the Bureau of Research of the Office of Education in the person of Professor Ianni invited me to submit a proposal on the culture of schools and schooling, we both understood that the time had come formally to inquire as comprehensibly and candidly as possible into the development of education in cross-cultural perspective. This meant, in effect, getting the issue away from the bureaucrats and into the hands of the liveliest professors and intellectuals we knew. In this effort, I can report some progress, but I shall not now outline the scope of the program. Several of you are members of the steering committee of the program and you will get the requisite reports at the appropriate time.

Now, it hardly needs to be said that schools are perhaps the most ubiquitous institutions in contemporary urban, industrial society, and increasingly the central arenas for the affective, cognitive and instrumental development of persons. As extended kin or quasi-kin continuity becomes foreshortened, the need for specialized training over long periods developed, a need which may turn out to be a function of the arrangement of our society, rather than an

imperative of technique. As socialization, in the general sense becomes increasingly associated with formal schooling, we are accordingly faced with the terrific problem of re-creating an educational system that will be adequate to the needs and potentialities of vast numbers of people during the greater portions of their lives. I will make no effort to anticipate the problems and possibilities that are going to be discussed during these next two days.

These are not problems, by the way, that can be safely left to the experts. There are no self, or other identified educational experts as such in this room. The very notion of the educational expert is of a piece which the fragmentation and bureaucratization of the contemporary social process generally.

It's really interesting, for example, to listen to a distinguished academician who has spent one or two generations in teaching and research at a succession of universities following on his own career as a student, deny that he knows anything about education. This fascinating aspect of self-alienation is in the same category as the well-known French gentlemen, who discovered, perhaps too late in life, that he had been speaking prose. In other words, we are all involved in education and it is time for us to introspect our experiences to discover what we know, which Socrates considered to be the truest and highest form

of knowledge.

To believe that there are educational experts who somehow possess the key to our dilemmas is both to shun responsibility and to believe in a kind of academic alchemy. Interestingly enough, most of the significant educational theorists in Western civilization have been and had to be philosophers. And most important Western philosophers from Plato, to Rousseau to Dewey have engaged in analytic or utopian efforts to construct or recreate the educational process. Education is, after all, a synonym for the cultural process at large. It is both the special and the general problem of mankind.

May I make two general points about the crisis in mass education before introducing Dr. Everett, who is, as I mentioned, the President of the New School as well as a most distinguished figure in the educational field.

The first of these points is quantitative. There are millions upon millions of people within the sphere of our own civilization and within traditional areas now subject to modernization who are going to have to be educated in more or less formal structures in ways that differ from the customary familial modes. But the quantitative problem is that the gap between the rich and the poor manifests itself increasingly in the field of education as it does generally throughout the world interlocking social economy. That is to

say, the law of circular cansation and cumulative effect, worked out by the Scandinavian sociological economists, primarily Nuvase and Myrdal, operates between the North Atlantic communities and most of the rest of the world. That is, there are upper class nations and lower class nations, bound together by an international class structure and these class distinctions incorporate educational distinction. Moreover, within a given State, whether new or old, the educational gap also appears to be growing. That is, in the most industrialized areas, although more people are being educated in one way or another and to some degree, a privileged stratum of the best educated, originally selected for that chance in a harmfully competitive manner, and defined by the inadequate formal and narrowly instrumental criteria we are prone to use, is also growing.

In the poorer, or less industrialized nations, for the most part, ex-colonial or quasi-colonial, the gap is less subtle and more inclusive. A tiny elite confronts a vast illiterate peasantry, whoe traditional structures are, to compound the problem, breaking down. So we are faced with the sheer quantitative dilemma.

For example, just how the three quarters of a billion Chinese or four hundred million Indians proceed to educate themselves in a contemporary context?

In the bibliographical effort we are making we have encountered some extremely interesting Chinese material, by the way, and we shall analyze it in our final report.

But the very notion, not only the dimension of the problem is new. The idea of formal mass education is the heritage of the European enlightenment, the axial age is of contemporary civilization in whatever place or form.

But we are also faced with a qualitative problem; the particular problem that intrudes itself in societies presumably based on the notions of universal democracy, having rejected or rendered obsolete previous modes of family and community organization.

One way of phrasing the qualitative problem is as follows: What are the most appropriate ways to help cultivate individuation, relatedness and vocational commitment of persons? How, in short, may we develop systems through which persons may learn to love and work is (still a pretty good definition of the human goal) without surplus repressions, without bearing the burden of irrelevant pain, by which I mean more than that which the fact of being human extracts from each of us?

We are therefore confronted with the obligation of criticizing our present system, which has failed in many of most significant ways; a signal failure since we have been the world's laboratory for mass education. The problem

718

of education then is the problem of culture, the natural habitat of the anthropologist whether professionally identified as such or not. Education is the critical anthropological problem and the purpose of this colloquium is to help us further to formulate it.

Dr. Diamond then introduced President Everett of the New School for Social Research. Dr. Everett expressed his delight at being present and his confidence in the ability of the colloquium participants to handle the subject at hand.

Some objections were raised concerning Goodman's definition of desirable relationships between teacher and pupil. None had taken any account of authority principles; between pupil and teacher there is inequality, hence authority is invoked sooner or later.

Goodman admitted this, but modified the term "authority" to include both coersive as well as non-coersive principles (by virtue of holding superior knowledge an adult might well induce a child to imitate him without force). There was also a difference between the authority of adults and that of peer group members.

It was generally agreed that legitimate authority did grow out of knowledge of objective facts or truths, but there were, after all, limits to the "natural" choices a child could make. Not all children were equally curious, and one could actually discourage curiosity by not encouraging it.

Goodman contended that limiting a child's desire to explore would cause "reaction-formation." At best, education should be aimed to removing the blocks in the way of a child's natural propensity to be curious.

Objection! Goodman doesn't simply "open up" to his own children...he stimulates them.

True, admitted Goodman, but only to the extent of varying their environment, of inducing responses by introducing new stimuli.

Enlightenment, the process of testing the assumptions of a culture, usually leads to such questions as, "Is our form of political economy the best and the only moral one?" "Does my life have meaning?" "Is goodness always rewarded?" "Is our form of marriage really the best?" "Are whites really the superior race?" "Is it right to be rich when others are poor?" and so on. There is no enlightenment unless the conventional answers to these questions, and many others like them, are constantly examined, and there can be no education unless there is enlightenment. Any so-called educational endeavor that does not do this is doing no more than tooling up for conventional occupations.

The question then arises: In our present world situation is enlightenment possible? Since 1917 almost a third of the earth's surface and a third of its people have developed political economies radically different from our own. These are the peoples who have already become socialist; meanwhile, other millions want it. The emergence of a new socialist humanity has been accompanied by the disappearance or extreme weakening of many capitalist powers, to the degree that, feeling beleaguered amidst the diminishing strength of its allies, America, according to Secretary of Defense Robert MacNamara, "has devoted

a higher proportion of its gross national product to its military establishment than any other major free-world nation. This was true even before our increased expenditures in Southeast Asia.

"We have had, over the last few years, as many men in uniform as all the nations of Western Europe combined -- even though they have a population half again greater than our own."*

The rise of socialism and the doubling of the number of violent revolutions since 1958 (also according to Mr. MacNamara) has left the United States with such an extreme feeling of vulnerability that one wonders whether it can tolderate enlightenment, for enlightenment always involves a reexamination of basic assumptions about political economy.

Since 1939 the central position of armaments in the American economy, the fact that the arms industries are its "balance wheel," as one Presidential commission put it; the fact that the balance wheel has become the pivotal gear, growing in importance each decade with our fear, is now taken for granted, because the fear has become domesticated. We are like those Africans among whom schistosomiasis is endemic, so that they think bloody urine is normal; or like the Kaingang Indians, whose teeth are so rotten, they wondered whether mine were real.

---

*From the text of Mr. MacNamara's address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, as reported in The New York Times, May 19, 1966.

When we ask therefore, under what conditions is enlightenment possible, and realize that it seems possible only when fears are few, while our own are numerous, we must wonder about our own possibilities.

With such general considerations in view, I shall examine the problem for our conference under the following headings: Political Economy, The Gross National Product, War, The Historic Necessity of Stupidity, The Occupational System, Leisure, Vulnerability, Narrowness, and Education of the Deprived.

Political Economy -- The citizens of any society must be taught to believe that their form of political economy is the only satisfactory existence. In our own society this is accomplished not only through verbal depreciation of other types of political economy, but, especially in the lower grades of school, by presenting educational materials as if decent human existence occurred in our type of political economy only. Elementary arithmetic, even the new mathematics, are presented in narrow middle-class settings. All of this restricts the possibilities of enlightenment.

Gross National Product -- At no point may anything be taught that might interfere with the gross national product. This means not only that materials suggesting the possibility of an austere life, or one

dedicated to materially unproductive activity must be excluded from, or muted in curricula, but also that people must be portrayed as spenders. Clothes designers must surely have been employed to develop illustrations for current elementary school readers, for when Dick and Jane series tell about the activities of the same family in a succession of stories, the entire family is wearing a different and attractive set of clothes in each story.

War -- School does not interfere with the idea that all wars fought by the United States are just. Nothing must be presented there that suggests that we could have done anything to avoid them, or that war is an unthinkable solution to contemporary problems. Pious sighs over the horrors of war have always been permitted, and sundry generals quoted, but little insight is given into war's causes, into American responsibility, into the general human responsibility for entertaining the possibility of war, or into the possibility of our citizens having the right to reject the bellicosity of its statesmen. Since the most important thing for a child to learn is that the United States must always have freedom to choose war when it pleases, nothing can be taught to dim this view. We cannot, for example, teach that violence is the last resort of even madmen, that a population has

a right to voice its fierce objection to war, or that hostility in the face of the possibility of universal bloodshed is unconscionable.

Education for docility is the first necessity of a civilization oriented toward war, and a danger of enlightenment is that it undermines docility and replaces it with courage. One of the many paradoxes of modern warfare is that it exploits docility to train killers.

The Historic Necessity for Stupidity -- Throughout history, whether among the so-called civilized, or so-called primitive, people have had to be taught to be stupid. For to permit the mind to expand to its outermost capabilities results in a challenge to traditional ways. Hence the paradox that while man is intelligent he must also be trained to be stupid, and that a certain amount of intellectual sabotage must be introduced into all educational systems. It is better to have a somewhat stupid population than one trained beyond the capacities of the culture to absorb intelligence. It is clear that teachers with incisive minds, willing to take their students along all possible logical pathways, willing to entertain all intelligent questions, are a danger to any system. Hence, all educational systems must train people to be unintelligent within the limits of the culture's ability to survive. That is to say, there seems to be a cutting point, where

if a people are too stupid the culture will fall apart, and where the culture will fall apart if they are too intelligent. The cutting point is where the upward curve of intellect meets the downward curve of culturally necessary stupidity.

Common controversies in education revolve not so much around what students should know, and how they should learn, but how stupid we can permit them to be without wrecking the country and the world. In education for stupidity a nice line has to be drawn between teaching the child how to make obvious inferences and letting him make inferences that are too far-reaching for comfort, between training him to see the validity or the truth of a proposition in plane geometry and teaching him to perceive the fraudulence of a proposition in advertising, political economy, international relations, and so on. Teaching a child to think has obvious perils, and for this reason has always been a delusive goal of education in our culture. In our culture, nobody can be taught to think, for example, where private enterprise, war or the gross national product might be threatened.

Socialist countries, of course, have <u>their</u> forms of socially necessary stupidity. The fruit of stupidity is invulnerability, for when one has been

rendered too stupid to penetrate an issue, he can only follow the crowd and the crowd always follows what is popular and what it thinks is safe, even though it often leads to perdition. In any culture, stupidity pays off in the social and political areas over the short run. This being the case there can be little inducement to being intelligent because intelligence leads to separation from the crowd and the crowd wants only to be safe from criticism and to have a good time.

This situation confronts the teacher at the college level in the "stone wall" effect: students who will not discuss, who will not object, who will not examine, and who are likely to become withdrawn and morose if forced to it by a determined teacher. What most of us encounter in the university are rows of moving hands that obediently write down whatever is said, and one need not worry about voicing the most radical opinions because they merely go into the notebook, along with the algae, ions, historic places, dates and names, equations and the dates of the next test.

Occupational Systems -- The occupational system in any culture has inexorable requirements because jobs must be filled if the culture is to survive, and in our culture the fundamental outlines of the occupational system are congruent with the economic system

and with the requirement of the gross national product. The occupational system is a fixed reality, like the sky, and this is true the world over. It follows that our educational system cannot enlighten regarding the possibilities of the soul, but must train children to fit the available jobs and teach students resignation to the occupational categories of the census bureau.

Children must be taught to accept the idea of fixed occupational niches and be so instructed that the freshman's question, "Philosophy is interesting, but what can you do with it?" will never become absurd. The question, "What am I doing with my life?" is the enemy of the question, "What job can I get?" The occupational system requires that the question "Is this what I really want to do?" should not rise into consciousness, for it is an iron law of culture that to the degree that education touches on occupation at all it must not permit the question to exist. Culture as a system of thought must exclude dialectical opposites, for when these are permitted to enter consciousness, they shake a culture to its foundations. The dialectic, however, is a magic quern that grinds out its contradictions no matter where it is; so that socialist countries, where the quern presumably came to rest forever, now have to cope with it too.

Leisure -- Nowadays since there is much talk about leisure, it is necessary to say a few words about this tired subject. For the average person, leisure is the time left to him after he has stopped working for pay. That is to say, for the overwhelming bulk of the labor force, from lathe operators, chippers, riveters and truck drivers, to switchboard operators, secretaries, nurses, teachers, doctors and so on, the main issue is what to do with themselves when they are not getting paid for doing it, or learning a trade, as in school.

It is obvious that no use of this time can be tolderated that will interfere with our political economy, the gross national product, or with stypidity, and that, therefore, there can be no education for enlightenment after hours. Fishing, boating, bowling, cabinet making, sex, and fixing up the basement can be engaged in because they help maximize the gross national product, but painting and reading not only make very minor contributions, as compared to the others, but too much reading of philosophy, history, etc., can be threatening to the system for they bring enlightenment.

People who have been through our educational system, however, will not use their leisure for anything but fun and games. It must also be borne in mind that an educational system that trains people for enlightening

activities during leisure would threaten the occupational and even the class structure. If too many people, on the basis of leisure time learning, were to start changing their occupations, considerable instability would be introduced into the occupational structure and hence into the class system. Hence, there is a fundamental contradiction between the idea of productive leisure on the one hand and the maintenance of our present political economy on the other.

Vulnerability -- There is no more vulnerable white collar group than educators. For the most part without unions, subject to the whims of principals, superintendants, boards of education, and local parent organizations, elementary and high school teachers stand unprotected at the bottom of one of the most extended pyramids of power in the country. Hence they are in no position, even should they desire, to teach anything that might challenge the cultural features of which I have spoken. What I have said applies equally to so-called higher education, for there we see that educators are, on the whole, untroubled by problems of academic freedom, because, having come through the mill, they have divested themselves of dangerous thoughts, so that they have, on the whole, no freedom to worry about. They are self-imprisoned without knowing it. What would they teach that is unconventional? In my own discipline

there are some brave men, who have spoken in public against the war in Vietnam, but anthropology as an academic discipline is more innocent of dangerous thoughts than the late Pope John. What has become invulnerable also becomes rigid, because life has become safe. Thus invulnerable people are frozen, no longer because of fear alone, but because, by the miracle of the dialectic they have come to feel so protected. Why venture out? Since invulnerability is thus a self-reinforcing system, it acts as an immovable obstacle to enlightenment.

Education must be narrow, it must not ask questions like, "Does life have meaning?" "What is meaning?" "What is the purpose of social life?" "What is the place in life of compassion, solicitude, wisdom?" "Is there a world history?" "Is one country's richness a function of another's poverty?" "Is my country best?"

It is clear that broadening the questions asked would also question our political economy as presently constituted. A general examination of the question of meaning in life by the whole population would immediately drive the Dow Jones index through the bottom, because people interested in the question would not play the market.

The Culturally Deprived -- In this segment of the population, the question is not quite as I stated it in the preceding paragraphs, for the culturally deprived, the most degraded of the Negro poor, have to be brought

up from the abyss before they can focus the issue of enlightenment. That is to say for this group basic tooling up to achieve a higher standard of living and equality with whites is the first order of business. The ghetto child has to be gotten out of it, and the only way to do it at the present time is for him to master the educational meterials presented to him in school. In these circumstances it is inevitable that he will support a system that helps him, and be less interested in enlightenment.

There are many technical problems still to be solved in upgrading the Negro child. For example, though Project Headstart results demonstrate that deprived children can indeed be given a head start in the pre-school years by special training, follow-up studies indicate that it may not do much good, because the kids start to lose ground anyway as soon as they enter the formal educational system. Something happens to the ghetto child either at home, in the peer culture or in the school, or in all three, that undercuts the strength he gets from Headstart.

Finally, I wish to modify somewhat what I said earlier about the ghetto child. Although technical beefing-up and protection against destructive environmental forces must be in the forefront of his education, somewhere along the line the Negro child has to be en-

lightened about the anti-Negro power structure, and how to fight it. Knowledge of this structure cannot be picked up simply by being a ghetto Negro, any more than knowledge of the white power structure comes simply from being white. Its complexities need teaching. Negro children need to know how, a century after emancipation, they are neither free nor equal, and how they are denied equal protection under the law, and equal opportunity. They need to have an exact analysis of the processes whereby, in their case, it has been possible for whites to act as if the Constitution did not exist.

In conclusion, I repeat that all cultures must introduce some intellectual sabotage into education. Some might argue that since, in the present stage of evolution, man is unable to develop a social system that will not make millions miserable, organized society would be impossible if everybody was smart because they would see through all shams, and social organization is impossible without sham. Others might argue that if the scales were lifted from the eyes of all, the hands of all might be against all, for each would see that the other is a liar. Some might urge that since man is incapable of constructing a system without massive flaws, it is better for children to be unable to perceive them.

However, I see no evidence that nature has set a certain pace on the clock of evolution, so that our brains will be regulated until such time as, having constructed a utopia, men may look the truth in the eye without murdering their neighbors. This being the case I see no choice but to seek enlightenment and introduce it into education.

Although education is the most safely armored bureaucracy in our culture, no armor is without chinks. We must plan, we must use every device of which we are capable; we must hammer at supervisors and teachers; we must lobby among legislators; we must besiege publishers, in the interest of enlightenment. We must find ways to breach the walls of fear and self-serving if we are to avoid repeated economic misery and world war.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FOLLOWING HENRY'S PAPER

The discussion which followed Henry's paper focused primarily on the possibilities for change within the condition of education in our society, described so convincingly in the paper. One of the essential problems, summarized by Diamond, is to develop informal modes of transmitting knowledge in the service of enlightened action, which again is the problem of education defined in its broadest sense. Diamond stressed the importance of defining education in this broadest sense rather than merely as formal schooling.

The problems and role of the culturally disadvantaged within society were discussed, Henry having commented that the first priority in educating the ghetto child may well have to be teaching skills and other means to cope with the economic system. Lewis remarked on the apparent contradiction in any attempt to help the lower class by integrating them into the institutional system described by Henry. Reisman pointed out that it is just this fact of absorption into the system that holds some promise for improvement in the system. That is, in its demand for entrance into the present system, the progressive underclass is making criticisms that are beginning to create openings into which concerned and "enlightened" professionals can move in an attempt to bring about

improvements. These criticisms are forcing deliberate and specific thought about the educational system. In their demands for participation in the larger society, Reisman predicts that the lower class will "change dramatically the occupational system, the educational system, the mental health system, the bureaucratization of the society."

In response, Lewis cited some of his own work and the studies by Glazer which indicate that in fact many families remain in poverty generation after generation and do not, as Reisman stated, manage somehow to rise out of poverty to become incorporated into the middle class. He suggested that even increasing incomes of the lower class may not have much effect on the culture of poverty. Reisman replied that his use of the term progressive underclass referred to only a segment of the lower class; the point he wanted to make was that it is the demands of this group for entrance that serve as a potential lever for change and that the fact of absorption into the middle class could not completely erase the changes brought about by the existence of the original demands.

As an aside Lewis remarked on a positive feature of the culture of poverty---the wide and varied

range of jobs held by a single individual giving him a kind of adaptability which individuals in the middle class so often lack.

Jencks suggested that perhaps society is not so well organized or integrated as most of the previous discussion seemed to assume, which makes it important to ask in what ways the condition of education is distinguishable from the condition of the larger society. In some areas schools may well be doing something to contribute to a solution of some of the problems discussed by Henry, while in other areas the schools seem to be making the situation worse than it might otherwise be. Schools, for example, probably contribute less to society's desire for material affluence than large industrial corporations, such as IBM. On the other hand schools would seem to promote an even narrower range of occupations than the already narrow range which presently exists. Jencks also made the point that schools seem to be in the control of a minority of professionals or an organized group that does not always promote the same kinds of values or standards or the same form of social organization that society as a whole may promote; he indicated the need for further development of this area of inquiry.

THE FOUR STAGES IN EDUCATION

Frank Reisman

The first session allowed us to deal with stances, postures and positions. I would like to be more specific about education in American schools.

There are, I believe, significant potentials for change in the schools. The key potential is that ignited by the integration movement. There are others though, related to the tremendous affluence of our society which, in spite of being generally depicted negatively, permits enormous educational programming. My own feeling is that the major slogan of the future will be "Welfare versus Warfare." Some groups have already adopted this slogan. Floyd McKissick of CORE, I think, hit it very hard at the 1966 White House Conference of Civil Rights.

This country has potential lying unused because, as Jules Henry and other people have said, of its devotion to an economically unnecessary war economy. It is a political question and it is therefore imperative to point political, civil-rights, anti-poverty and other groups to welfare programs which includes, in its formulation, education.

I do not suggest that we overlook criticisms of the society made here today; I merely indicate that to provide forward motion, one must concentrate on things

other than negatives.

In formulating goals, moreover, it is not possible to work independently of historical trends. Education does not exist in the abstract for me, though it does for some people from whose opinions we can benefit. Therefore I have to look at what I see as a major force in society in terms of economic development in the next 20 years. And what I see is a major break through in human services, an enormous increase in the number of professional, sub-professional and non-professional human services workers. A number of economists have postulated as much as 50% of the society will be engaged in this kind of activity 30 years from now. We must examine this trend to utilize and maximize it positively, to reduce alienation. The educational system is simply not preparing people for these future developing jobs in society.

My programming for the future is in the direction of this developing strata, the professional and non-professional human service workers, whom I think are coming to be an extremely dominant force in the society, and I want to see education in relation to that.

Our educational system, as we have said repeatedly, is not educating at all. By extending experience gained in working with the educationally disadvantaged, it may be possible to derive education technology appropriate for all people in society.

339

FOUR STAGES IN EDUCATION

The following four-stage schema though related to, most narrowly, the educationally disadvantaged, has wider applications if one were to modify it.

As a preface, let me state the need in a drastic revamping of the whole curriculum. For example, history as presently taught is neatly compartmentized into periods adjusted to the length of the class term.

Whether the kids can read or not, whether they are interested in history or not, or whether they know anything at all in the area covered, is immaterial; the teacher teaches what the curriculum dictates.

I would suggest that this approach be abandoned. Let the first stage be what Weinstein and Fantini call in a forthcoming book Contact Curriculum, or curriculum directed to contact and motivation.

In other words, let all of our methods, techniques, insights, and teaching skills be turned to making contact with the youngster, to interest him in learning. He would have been interested in learning in the first place had he not been smashed by the existing teaching system and environmental "cultural features."

Parenthetically, let me say that youngsters do not do well after Operation Head Start, not because of their family, but because the school system regresses them.

Operation Head Start and other pre school programs give kids a little of school know-how and a little push. When they enter the school system itself, they respond to its inadequacy by regressing out intellectually and emotionally.

I suggest that the phrase "children progress through the school system" should be changed to "they regress through the school system."

These kids are very bright when they come to the system; they don't so much need a lot of head starting as they do contacting.

I am suggesting the development and application of a new and varied approach, particularly at Stage One, e.g. games, role playing, dance, etc.

This Contact Stage may be slow. It takes time to win a child's interest and motivate him to learn. Teachers must be trained for contact teaching. Some teachers can interest children marvelously. Some cannot. Forces are effectively deployed. Good contact teachers are filmed, the latter are then projected in classrooms. Both teachers and children learn together how to contact, how to be contacted.

Stage One was concerned with motivation. Stage Two is much more concerned with learning how to learn. I would have them learn how to use what Jensen calls

Verbal-mediating Techniques. Many youngsters do not know how to use words as problem-solving tools, and Jensen has developed a whole series of reinforcing techniques for developing this skill or set.

I would have youngsters function as teachers and helpers as a form of becoming self conscious about learning.

We might use individual tutoring instruction at this stage, to assist the youngster in developing his style.

Stages One and Two are slow, very slow. Stages Three and Four, on the other hand, are rapid. Paul Goodman and many others have pointed out that with new programmed technology and individualized instruction, once the youngster is motivated and knows how to learn, skills and subject matter are rapidly acquired.

The mistake of program learners is to think that they can begin with programmed learning. They succeed to the extent that the program catches the child's interest, and in a sense they skip through the contact stage quickly: or they are selective where some kids have been contacted and the program is a useful speed-up learning for them.

But if one systematically contacts and teaches a large number of youngsters one can then expect rapid developments with programs. of skill learning in subject matter. These programs can be monitored by non-professionals and sub-professionals. Non-professionals immedi-

ately can play a tremendous role in releasing teachers from many of the non-professional tasks, such as attendance-taking. The non-professional can provide a connection to the child, providing a model to the child as a human service worker.

Individualized instruction, lightly emphasized in the first two stages, becomes very important in Stage Three.

In Stage Four, occuring simultaneously with Stage Three, one might begin with discussing issues, thinking about problems, developing understanding rather thanskills.

A great variety of approaches and techniques can be used throughout. For example: role playing can be used at many of the stages, but with different purposes in mind.

In Stage One, you would use it as a contact, or, using the action style of the youngster to involve him in the learning. In Stage Two, you would have him use it to learn school know-how, having him role-play the teacher, etc. It might not be used in Stage Three, but could certainly apply it in Stage Four.

I would not aim merely to bring kids up to grade level as Sheppard does so successfully in St. Louis. I want to bring them far beyond grade level, and smash the grade levels. The major deterrent to accomplishing, is not the home, but the fact that the kids move out of the school area. Home environment is frequently more positive than the

schools know how to utilize; but what happens is that when a kid is functioning well, starting to develop, and starting to learn, and he suddenly is physically moved. The mobility and the migration in the neighborhoods of the poor is enormous.

How to deal with that question? One must either effect adjourning schools or permit youngsters who move out of the area to shuttle back to school. One might also think about compelling neighborhood changes which will reduce mobility.

School improvement itself has the potential of reducing mobility, though it is only one factor. In some neighborhoods, mobility has decreased due to increased service integration of what is a highly fragmented system. The education system can be utilized to promote this co-ordination. I would argue for planned intervention in the community, not only to change the school system, but also to change the service system and jobs in the neighborhood.

Many groups in this country are concentrating on proposals such as guaranteed annual income, Rather than demanding concrete things such as one million non-professionals service jobs. The New Republic, for example, is filled with criticism of the Anti-Poverty Program, but has no program of its own. The civil rights movement, likewise.

Or perhaps only programs for people on welfare or . . . . not the sort from which one produces a social movement. People want jobs and services, not just participation; you can get them to participate and organize around jobs, and the government can be made to deliver those jobs.

Anti-poverty is spending the money. We should be upgrading jobs. The social and political significance of new careers for the poor has not penetrated through yet, though we are working very hard in the civil rights movement to make this kind of demand. Too many people are still talking about jobs such as public works.

The fundamental direction of the society is towards the development of jobs in the human service field. And even people who are highly deprived and impoverished can very quickly move, learn and become involved when given jobs with systematic training built in.

The current mythology is America about education is that everybody has to go through the school system; that that is the only way to get a meaningful job in the future professional world.

That's a terribly pleasing idea. From the President on down, everybody talks about the great future automated world, where you're going to have lots of education, and you have to start the kids younger and get them through the education system.

But, this leaves out all of the people who cannot go all the way through the school system as well as those older than eighteen. I happen to be very fond of people older than eighteen. I think they're going to be very important; and consequently I am interested in them, no matter what their education has been. I agree with Paul Goodman that one could immediately provide them with sub-professional jobs while expanding toward educational system.

I never oppose centralization and coordination. I simply fight concommitantly for participation and for local basing. I think it's regressive to throw out centralization. I think centralization is a part of history, and a positive part of history, and I think it produces things much more effectively, and I don't say that because they centralize they're going to do some bad things. I think then you give up, because centralization does in part produce efficiency.

If you have some goals, you want them efficiently done. You also want decentralization. I think you can get both. There are mechanisms for doing this. There are too many people philosophizing about it, and very few people even think in terms of mechanisms. For example, the local neighborhood service centers, which we can have for all of the poor people in the United

States for one hundred million dollars! We can have these local storefront centers, and have tremendous participation built into them.

Discussion following Frank Riesman's paper

While impressed by the need for "tooling-up" educationally, Jules Henry felt the whole question does not address itself to the growing gap between poor and rich nations and does not confront the problem of the causes of wars.

Vidick pointed out that Riesman's speculations of educational "tooling-up" is going to demand a good deal of bureaucratic control, more than already exists. Students, as it is, already consider showing how to get by a school's bureaucracy more important than learning in depth. Real learning, in fact, seems to take place only when teachers ignore the school system's formal requirements.

Diamond confirmed this thesis by reading quotes collected by his daughter in high school. The quotes reflected the feeling that students have of being treated, weighed and measured, but never encouraged to think for themselves.

Goodman felt that consideration of educational technology is philosophically meaningless. His own daughter had solved complex logical problems because her home environment had encouraged this. Riesman's concern with instilling motivation to learn was a waste of time. Motivation should come out of pleasant and concrete experiences, not artificial stimulation. The potential to learn is found in all children.

Diamond took issue with this, noting that it was never really too late to ignite a child's motivation to grow intellectually and emotionally.

Riesman replied that he merely wanted to change the school environment, not society or families. He wanted to retain kids in school so as to make possible their learning something.

Reisman reiterated that the business of schools is to teach people skills and to involve them in the thinking process. Children learn outside of school, of course...from their environment, from political events and so on.

He disagrees with Goodman & Bancroft that all that is necessary to get kids to learn is to "turn them loose," not in a culturally-deprived environment, anyway.

Henry wanted to know more about how kids regress out of the school system. He felt this was more important than the curriculum content. He also disagreed with Riesman when he said that the home is not an important influence on education. Major deterrent is not known, but certainly the home is most important. He again made his point that the American political economy, problems of wars, etc., make it exceedingly difficult to create "enlightenment." You can bus kids from here to eternity, but everything depends on what they think about. Where's this going to come from? Not from home, not from textbooks...

the word slum doesn't even appear in most texts.

Another participant was even more pessimistic than Henry, feeling that there was no way of penetrating into the US and indeed the world dominated by modern corporations. Such corporations do not permit the essential interpersonal processes leading to effective growth. This has been Paul Goodman's central point for the last 10 years. Thus in school, kids learn how not to react, just as teachers learn how to judge largely in bureaucratic criteria.

Jencks wanted to modify Goodman, pointing out that eclectic institutions do not necessarily confine all aspects of all personalities. In the basement of such institutions, so to speak, all sorts of learning activities take place.

Green felt that perhaps the function of schools is not to educate at all, not to bring "enlightenment." Riesman's concept of reform is quite modest. The big job is to conceptualize a radically new definition of education, in which the school is only a part.

Riesman rebutted by reminding him that millions of dollars are being funded to school administrators -- and they are going in the wrong direction.

Nelson objected to the absense of a common center in the discussion. Goodman wants to reconstruct society,

Henry to bring enlightenment, Riesman to deal with schools only. He felt the group should tak about actual centers and dynamics of actual societies.

Ianni agreed with Goodman that schools are not so much captive institutions as institutions with their own hierarchy and strengths.

Riesman points out that within bureaucratic hierarchies are contained anti-systems which create change and movement. Thus student, parent, civil rights participation in education will help change the system while not changing the character of our war economy. And lastly -- his reforms were not all that modest!

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Christopher Jencks

Everybody's remarks so far have covered things which they thought were so. I want to make an opposite tack, with an hypothesis which I am not at all sure I can defend.

I'm going to assume that Dr. Lewis will talk about education as it relates to the culture of poverty. I'm going to talk about education as it relates to a culture of affluence.

In general, the hypothesis begins with the proposition that America is being taken over by a new class, a new middle class, if you will, and that their power rests not on property like the old middle classes, but on control over specialized knowledge, or expertize.

From that hypothesis you can derive several fairly obvious correlaries. One is that professional credentials will become increasingly important in every aspect of American life, because without credentials laymen can't tell experts from quacks. We need some kind of identity cards to pick them out.

The second correllary is that as a result of the demand for certification, there is an inexorable increase in the amount of time people spend in school, so that you can predict that by 1980 that people will stay in school a year more than they do now. Indeed if one makes the kind of trend projection dear to the hearts of policy planners, you can show that in another two hundred years, we'll spend our whole life in school.

It seems to me that in that context, there is a grave question confronting Americans, America, and the

educational system, as to how the professional experts are going to be contolled and administered and organized. There are two models for this. One is that professional expertise is directed by one kind of bureaucracy or other, with top down control. The public school system is a good example of this.

The alternative pattern is what we have traditionally called the independent professions, in which there is no central bureaucracy controlling the professionals, but a semi-autonomous group of entrepreneurs, small businessmen of a sort. Control sometimes exercised by colleagues over each other, sometimes not at all.

You can put this question in an over-simplified form. Will corporation lawyers be responsible to other corporation lawyers or to corporation directors; will university professors look for standards to other university professors; engineers feel answerable to other engineers, or salesmen? Or you can put it in a more mechanical way. One development has been the growth of the ratio of engineers in engineering firms to engineers employed by bureaucracies.

I have no great enthusiasms for either bureaucratic or colleaguial control, but as between the two, I prefer the latter. It seems to be that loyalty to one's colleagues is more likely to generalize into loyalty to one's fellow man, whereas loyalty to one's superior is more likely to become loyalty to the status quo.

Regardless of one's preferences, though, it seems clear, that the American educational system is a continuum in which control is very bureaucratic at the lowest levels and becomes more colleaguial as one moves up. The kinds of jobs students head for seem to reflect the kind of control they saw when they chose careers.

An elementary school is a bureaucratic, managerial enterprise, run by a Board of Education, a Superintendent, a Principal, curriculum coordinators, and so on down the line to the proletariat---the students.

At the top of the educational system, the model is much closer to that of the independent professions. Each university professor is something of an entrepreneur, although there is, of course, an element of the bureaucratic and managerial in the university.

I think it is very unrealistic to think that bureaucratic education will make room for the culture in which most of the people in this room believe.

This sort of thing may survive somewhat clandestinely in the basement from moment to moment, as someone said yesterday, but basically, it seems to me that the possibility of sustaining and spreading it in public schools which are bureaucratic and managerial is very small.

At the top level of this system, in the major universities, and especially in the graduate schools, the

system is unbureaucratic in most ways. I say this very advisedly. For three months last year I worked with the Board of Regents in California, and I think I've seen as much bureaucracy as a lot of people, but basically, I think that The University of California, for all of its follies is much closer to the way that Clark Kerr described it in The Uses of the University: "A federation of entrepreneurs held together by a common grievance over parking." That quip comes closer to the truth than the views of the Free Speech Movement which saw Berkeley as a factory managed by the State, the Regents, etc.

Compared with the school system, I would say, the university model is pretty flexible. It can accomodate a good measure of genius along with fools. It can accomodate at least a certain amount of intelligence along with pablum. There are some good books in the library and some bad ones. There's even some room for heretics and despite all that's wrong, the university seems to be to give rise to a good proportion of what's best in America, from the moral protests to the cultural and technical edifices. That's not saying much, I recognize. Certainly the university is not enough to save us from World War III.

Now if you look at that model a bit further, you find the point at which a student leaves the system has a rather close relationship to the kind of adult work that he goes into.

In other words, the students who enter the economy early from the more managerial sections of the educational system, are chanelled into occupations dominated by bureaucratic and managerial control. The longer they stay in this educational system--the closer they get to the graduate school level--the more likely they are to gravitate into the independent professions.

I think this trend is especially clear if you look at the pattern of occupational choices at the leading universities: Students are becoming more and more professional and less and less business-oriented. They don't want to work for an organization or corporation which keeps them at a long chain of command, a long distance from their ultimate boss.

The reasons for this are pretty clear on the whole. Most students who go through the university are influenced by the life-style of their professors, by the university's form of organization. This pattern attracts them more than any other they have been exposed to, and especially more than to the bureaucratic model of the public schools.

The idea of being a professional and knowing a lot appeals to them more than the organization-man image. I say this recognizing that there is a minority in the university which rejects the professorial model, as well as rejecting the university model or organization.

Now, the educational system can move in either of two directions in the next 20 or 30 years. One possibility is that the university will become more like the school systems, will become more managerial, will become more centralized. In a sense this would mean going back to the collegiate model which prevailed before the rise of the research-oriented university. Then the President was much more of a king than he is now and the whole sense of corporate control was greater. The trustees were much more omnipresent and dominant than they are now. We could recapitulate this only on a larger and more successful scale, If this happens, the universities will become more organized from the top down--there will be less room for entrepreneurs, less room for dissent, etc.

An alternative possibility is that the schools will become more like the universities. They will become more professional, more open, and less dogmatic, more pluralistic, more ready to sustain a minority culture, or a number of them.

Today I see movement in both of these directions. If you look at the fastest growing institutions of higher learning, they are the junior colleges and the former teacher colleges, now state colleges. These still have a tradition like that of the public school in some ways, and the students who come out of those institutions make occupational choices which reflect docils, managerial

tradition. They're more likely to be eager to go to work for a bureaucracy, either public or private, then are students who come from the leading universities and pre-graduate liberal arts colleges.

They're less likely to be oriented to the independent professions, and they have much less confidence in their own ability as entrepreneurs.

There are other forces working in the same direction centralizing power in the universities. One is the big organized research project, which has led to a bureaucratization of the intellect. The recent efforts to channel university funds through university administration rather than have individual professors negotiate directly with Washington will have the same effect, restoring the central power of the university to control the individual faculty member. The administrators, argue, of course, that otherwise there will be absolute chaos.

The impulse to centralize power and control professorial activity comes from the faculty as well as the administration. Faculty exercise very little prior control over one another's research, but they exercise a lot more pre-censorship in teaching. A man can't teach in a new way without getting permission, and that is more than a formality. I would say that the faculty as a whole has the same impulse as the administration to check up on people, although each individual member of the faculty may resist it.

On the other side of the coin is the fact that top academic teachers are in short supply and they're in a position to set their own terms of employment. This means they have more autonomy than they did a generation ago.

If you look at the school system, you can see signs of movement toward the university model. I had a drink yesterday with a friend of mind who is in the publishing business, and he sees a major change in the publishing industry, which is essentially a by-product of the paperback book. The number of books published has gotten so large that school boards cannot possibly read them all. Not only that, but the school administration can't read them all. So the whole process of approving and adapting books has begun to break down. The decision has to be left to the teacher, who has much more of a choice of what kind of a book he wants to use. This seems like a small thing, but it relates to the general problem of giving individual teaching more room to maneuver--more power and responsibility.

The introductions of contact between the schools and universities seems to me another thing that is hopeful. A teacher who wants to do something new has another source of authority to which he can appeal. "Professor Zacharias says that we should teach it this way." That is a good answer to a stodgy principal or even to a school board. I think giving teachers more fellowships

and more summer study programs help. Anything which gives them some kind of negotiable credentials to show a prospective employer helps provide job mobility. That makes it easier for a teacher to bargain with his present employer. Almost anything that gives public recogniation to a particular teacher, which he can use outside of the system which employs him, gives him leverage on the local bureaucracy.

Taking all of these observations together, I would say that we're moving towards a system that will be more homogeneous from top to bottom. I think we will end up with a system that runs from pre-school to graduate school, dominated by the academicians, shaped more by professional than by managerial values.

Now, I can hear everybody saying - at least I can hear myself saying - that the idea of remaking the schools in the image of the university is not really very exciting. If that's the best we can do, maybe we should just burn the schools down. Maybe Paul is right.

The same thing is true of society as a whole. Replacing General Motors with the University of California isn't my idea of a cause worth dying for. And, to get back to Jules Henry's point, I'm sure that it isn't going to prevent World War III or most of the other disasters we fear.

But if you want a more radical sort of change, if you want education to produce what Jules Henry called

"enlightenment," if you really want to alter the society in which we now live, you have to go outside the formal system of schools and universities.

I think that's true even if you want to sustain or spread a minority culture. You're not going to be able to do it within the system of formal education to any significant extent. The most we can hope for is the kind of transition which I've described, from managerial to professional values.

If you despair of the system of formal schooling, what are the alternatives? We always say that the schools are only one part of education, but we usually end up talking about the school anyway. It's a ritual disclaimer--"I am not and never have been guilty of assuming that all education takes place in schools." After we repeat the formula, though, we ignore it.

Now I think that one of the fundamental questions that we ought to address is why is it that we're so mesmerized and paralyzed by the school system. Why do we think of it as the only educational tool we have?

A child's year has about 9000 hours. Of these, about 1000 are spent in school. Of those 1000 hours, the school is lucky to get the child's attention for 100. You also have to remember that schools have legal control over the child for only 10 out of 70 or more years of life, and not the most important ten years either.

Why is it that the school system seems to be able to monopolize all of our thinking about the educational possibilities in this society? Or, maybe we can put it the other way round. Why is it that the school system, with what appears to be a rather modest economic resources (less than 5 percent of GNP) still has such a hold on society?

I propose that instead of discussing what I've just said about the school system, we consider some of the non-school possibilities, some of the other educational institutions. What are their possibilities and why aren't they being realized?

I've made a list of half a dozen things which we could talk about in this context. Political action groups of various kinds are probably a more appropriate forum than educational institutions for some of the things that we're talking about today. They are probably more educational in some respects than any system of formal schooling can be. Certainly they encourage people to learn by doing.

Then there is a gamut of ameliorative groups which are formally apolitical--welfare agencies, the Junior League, etc., etc., etc. There is a whole range of Cultural Institutions with a capital "C", from museums to magazines to T.V. Stations. There is that wonderful old institution known as "The Church", which has a great deal of money, and has a hold over large numbers of people.

It reaches a much wider span that the schooling system, and in some instances runs a school system of its own. Not only that, but these church schools at least claim to deal with a lot of the questions which we have accused the public school of begging. I thought of this yesterday when Jules Henry spoke. The kinds of fundamental questions that are not raised in public education are in principle raised in the parochial schools. The answers which are given to them may be ritualistic and uninteresting, but the proposition that schooling is about these questions is at least accepted.

Then you have a whole set of organizations nominally for amusement, like television, newspapers, etc. Children spend an enormous amount of time in the clutches of such organizations. The children I know are more influenced by these organizations, and sometimes in more educational ways, than they are by former schooling.

Finally, there's our old friend the family. Instead of saying, well the family is in a decline or something like this, and that's why the school system has to do the job, I think it would be useful to question whether the family actually is in a decline, which I seriously doubt. If it is, why? Is that good or bad? What can you do about it?

In many ways, the family is at least as subject to ameliorations as the formal school system.

DISCUSSION FOLLOWING CHRISTOPHER JENCK'S PAPER

The discussion focused on two quite opposite poles of the education and social change question: From what direction could one expect change and would students act as agents and promoters of change? And how much of an agent <u>against</u> change were educational bureaucracies?

Jenck's pessimism, Henry felt, might be moderated by being conscious of all opportunities open to those concerned with change: In the blizzard of textbooks, for example, consultants to publisher might well promote the kind of books conducive to social change. Jencks agreed but reminded of his point that, at best, schools can improve themselves to reach the levels of university, but cannot overreach this level.

Vidick followed this up by noting that, try as one might to find outside leverages to induce change in education, leadership continues to come from the precinct of universities. As an example, he cited the students in revolt who, unsatisfied with passive learning, not intimidated by the System, have come to develop ideas contributing to social change. Many middle class students, however, enter the professional world, move to the suburbs where they reproduce, in a sense, the cultural and social milieu of the university. They might even, while working for a corporation, pay lip-service to anti-establishment causes...

not sufficiently loud, to be sure, to be heard very far. In the long run, then, the educational system itself works for the establishment.

Yes, someone pointed out, schools provide leadership of the future - because everyone goes to school. So what?

School, Goodman felt, have become parent-surrogates and thus must absorb much of the rebellion that middle class children are afraid of directing against their parents. In thus providing the milieu, the occasion to "react against," schools are actively fostering social change.

To argue that social change should or might be expected to come from professionals is to accept the premises of "mandarinism," Goodman also felt. To address oneself to the question: Where does the professional owe his loyalties - to his peer group or to the bureaucracy, is to face the wrong problems. The old-fashioned professional, perhaps, he who owed loyalty to the client, the community, students, might be a relevant agent of social change. Students contributing to the kind of social change desired are those who demand informal, activist education.

The "student movement," it was pointed out, is an inadequate term to describe youths in rebellion, for they are not limited to the college campus. Many such youths were to be found in high schools, down to students

in the ninth grade. The movement, furthermore, is not uniquely aimed at highly visible sources such as the war in Viet Nam, civil rights and so on. "They want a different kind of society. They want different levels of honesty in their student-teacher relationships.... they're intolerant of the culture as a whole." This movement is becoming a separate culture. When we talk of changing school patterns we mean changing the administration and the faculty. But in the future, we'll have to deal directly with the victims as well -- the students.

The existence of student movements was not denied, but surely, someone replied, such movements could not be expected to lead an educational revolution.

Wallace then turned the attention of the session to the role of bureaucracy in social change. He referred to a concurrently running conference in behavioral science research at which he had noted that, when a large number of scholars were working in projects calling for cooperation, a sizeable bureaucracy was inevitable. There was no way of avoiding the formation of this apparatus, either in research or in school systems. The problem, therefore, was how to design a "good" bureaucracy, one capable of internal flexibility and of effecting significant social change as well. The role of bureaucracy in school, moreover, should be set while keeping in mind that schools themselves played a relatively small part in the total scope of education.

The church, Seeley remarked, can almost be defined as a pure bureaucracy, and yet manages to sponsor novelty and spontaneity. This example would be worth imitating. One might also place within every bureaucracy a counter-bureaucratic bureau.

Jencks recognized the fact that a bureaucracy would emerge as a result of the need for cooperation, but he wondered if the need for sequential cooperation was not frequently exagerated. There is an insane amount of planning involved in a four-year college curriculum.

The amount of bureaucracy should be directly related to the imperative needs of avoiding serious errors. Doctors, who are relatively unplagued by bureaucracy, can make serious errors leading to death; and never be brought to account for their action. In education, on the other hand, where many small mistakes can be tolerated without serious harmful effects, much less bureaucracy should be called for.

The session ended with the observation that it was not so much the mere existence of an educational bureaucracy which was of concern as a self-aggrandizing one.

THE ART AND SCIENCE OF TEACHING

Francis Ianni

The title of this session, The Art and Science of Teaching, epitomizes both the essential dichotomy of the educational process: the science or theory of instruction as contrasted to the art or practice of teaching, and the two different levels of scholarly interest in the study of the teaching process-here the distinction being between the structure of what is taught and how we go about teaching it. Both the theory of instruction and the structure of the disciplines have received far more scholarly interest and concern in recent years than the art of teaching or any new insights into pedagogy. In fact, they may have received far more interest than they deserve. The cognitive psychologist, for example, having sated himself on learning theory has, in almost the manner of the anthropologist running short of exotic cultures discovering modern American society, begun to systematize a theory of instruction which is companion to learning theory. Still crude and untried, still more a series of propositional theorems than a comprehensive theory, this beginning at least gives some comfort in knowing that some competent people are at work. At the same time, one of the more recent of the many "revolutions" in education -- the reform of the curriculum -- has attracted

the attention of the university scholar who joining with his colleagues in physics or mathematics or in music or the social sciences, has attempted to improve the course content of what is taught in the schools with varying results. Where the community of scholars has shown the least interest, however, is where the educationist has shown the need for most help in the analysis of the instructional process as a transmitter and amplifier of culture and in the role of the teacher within the social system of the school. Let me just point to a few problems in each of these areas and suggest some possible interests for further discussion.

The Analysis of the Instructional Process

One of the important steps still to be accomplished is the development of a theoretical framework for the study and the practice of teaching which transcends the behavioral elements of the act and recognizes the cultural context within which it takes place. A few examples:

(1) If we rule out, for the moment the many correlative studies of intelligence and family background or child rearing practices and personality, little systematic study appears to have been given to the child rearing antecedents of cognitive behavior and even less to the development of teaching strategies based upon such knowledge. And yet, if we consider learning as essentially

an exploration of alternatives and one of the functions of teaching as the economizing of random activity in such choice, then any attempt to encourage such exploration through the art of teaching must take into account the fact that the propensity to explore is heavily conditioned by the cultural context within which it takes place. That is to say, every culture produces predisposing factors which develop or inhibit the child's drive to explore and to consider alternatives. An adequate pedagogy, then, must understand these factors and develop an instructional strategy which builds upon or vitiates the predisposing factors.

(2) The present mood of so-called diagnostic teaching which places strong emphasis on the individualization of instruction posits certain optimal conditions for instruction: specifically (a) that the teacher should operate within a system which identifies and exploits the antecedent experiences and encounters which predispose a child to learn; (b) that the information to be transmitted must be based in a careful structuring of knowledge that is optimal for comprehension and which is presented in the properly programmed sequence and, finally, that the system must comprehend the nature and pacing of rewards and punishments. Here again the cultural context becomes a critical if largely overlooked factor. Obviously such

cultural elements as the degree of intellectual stimulation the child receives from his family, the value the society places upon learning, and the richness of the cultural environment will structure his predisposition to learn. Again, the structure of knowledge and the mode of presentation are heavily dependent on the complexity of society. We see, for example in our own society, instructing the young by telling about in abstraction -- telling out of context -- as compared to the showing in action which forms the instructional mode in primitive societies. Finally the numerous examples of cultural differentiation of rewards and punishments are as obvious intra-culturally from class to class as they are cross culturally. It would seem that it is regional as well.

A third problem -- One of the great pedagogical inventions of the new education -- as it was the last time it was invented in the days of Socrates -- is inductive teaching. As important as the inductive approach seems to be in the teaching-learning sequence, there are certain obvious problems it presents as a model for how a society should proceed to transmit its culture to the young. Given the limited amount of time available for learning in modern society and the vast amounts which could profitably be learned, there must be some emphasis placed on economies of time and effort. Not everything can be learned inductively,

nor is there time to try. We may yet bless the computer as a resource for the presentation of general rules and that which must always be taught by rote. Even so, it would seem that as knowledge expands, we must increasingly face the companion questions of "what shall be taught and to what end?" and "what information has become technologically and culturally obsolete and should be given lower priority or perhaps not be taught at all?"

Schools are not random associations of teachers, students and administrators but rather are well ordered systems with a well defined institutional structure and normative system. Schools are part of a well articulated institution which has an existence apart from the church, and even the state. As in any organic structure, all of the parts must be understood before any of the parts can be systematically developed. If we consider that the school consists in four major domains, the students or learners, the instructors or teachers, the materials taught or the curriculum and the environment within which all of this takes place, - the spatio and temporal arrangements within the school, the "administrative climate", the ways in which teachers and pupils are deployed, the traditions, customs and folklore of that school which makes it different from others - if we consider all of these factors then we are looking at the school as a

social system and it becomes amenable to the same kinds of structural analysis as any other social system. Most of our study to date, however, has centered on the learner as part of this system and in recent years on what is taught in that system. Let's consider the teacher as a part of the organizational structure for a moment. Three examples will suffice.

(1) For the moment accept all of the characterizations of the school as a series of cubicles into which the children and the teachers file everyday and in which the teacher must assume an essentially custodial role. Further, lets not argue with the obvious fact that role conflict is a constant and aggravating part of every teacher's daily life where she is, for example, told to be creative, yet is given neither the time nor the space within which to even think how she might go about this and where she is commanded to be innovative while remaining the fountainhead of the traditional values of the society. Let's accept all of this and then ask what would be necessary to change the teacher to make her into the preceptor, tutor, analyst and mother we would have her be? I hasten to say I don't know the answer but I do suspect that what we are really dealing with here is much more than changing the job-description of the teacher or giving her a private office and time to think and plan or even firing every teacher in the country

and replacing them with inspired amateurs, scholars, businessmen or even a tree and a swimming pool or computers. Rather we are dealing with a complete redefinition of what and who the teacher is and, more importantly, what teaching should be in a particular social system. Either in spite of or because of the emphasis of the curriculum reform movement, the schools tend to teach subject and no longer teach children. Any such redefinition of the role of the teacher must not only relate the teacher to the social system of the school but must come to grips as well with the extirpation of learning from the action that takes place in the general society and question the very existence of schools.

(2) The preparation of teachers is a second area which has been left to educationists with less than happy results. Here again, in the interest of economy let's dispense with any disciplined-approach to the question and accept the proposition that what has been lacking in the preparation of teachers is that illusive quality which is at once the mark of the true professional in any field and the most austere of all mental qualities - the sense for style. Style in art, style in literature, style in logic, style in science and style in teaching all have fundamentally the same quality -- an admiration and striving for the direct attainment of a forseen end, simply and without waste. As in art, archaeology or culture history, however, style in teaching can best be understood as a

manifestation of the culture as a whole, what Shapiro has called the "visible sign of its unity" and "the inner form of collective thinking and feeling". The paradox here is that while the enlightenment came at least partially as a reaction against scholasticism, we continue to expect the school and the teacher to foster enlightenment without any understanding of it. The elements of style in teaching as well as in learning their relationship to the culture and how one goes about instilling a sense of style in teachers are all questions still to be answered.

Finally, there is the question of the role of teacher in the transmission of cultural values. Is the teacher to be the objective purveyor of knowledge or does he have a defined role to play in acculturation? The general materialization of Western Culture and the high value placed on techniques have seen education progressively degenerate into instruction. Remember that instruction is the process of putting information into the person - it literally means "to build into; whereas education, in the sense of the Latin word from which it is derived - educere - "to lead forth -" connotes much more responsibility for socialization. The social function of education formal or informal in any society is to introduce the youngster to the founding myths and rituals that bind together those who share a common practice and doctrine

and to shape their personalities to conform to certain ideal types. The introduction, in modern societies, of the teacher into this process of socialization at increasingly earlier ages and with a broader social range of children requires attention to the questions of who explicates the values and how does society determine that they are properly taught?

All of these questions remain to be answered and each of them has an urgency for answering. In a deep sense, they are all part of that wonderful yet maddening characteristic of American education and of the culture which has produced it - the faith in a process rather than in any particular product or attained result. As a colleague of mine recently observed, social problems in Europe lead to revolutions while in this country we attempt to solve the problem by inventing a new course into the curriculum. Until we understand the art as well as the science of teaching, more courses are hardly the answer.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FOLLOWING FRANCIS IANNI'S PAPER

A major portion of the discussion following Ianni's paper focused on the problem of creating conditions under which the teacher can function in a more creative and innovative capacity. Ianni indicated that a prime difficulty derives from the way in which the teacher's role is defined. First there are a number of functions in addition to actual teaching taken on by schools, and for one reason or another, many of these functions have come to be defined as part of the teacher's job. Thus teachers must also be custodians, record keepers, etc. One solution then is to use other kinds of individuals as well as machines to relieve the teacher of many "secondary" responsibilities.

Secondly, the teacher's role has been defined as one which allows only for teaching. Witness the fact that any outside income-producing activity is called moonlighting. Unlike all other professions teaching is one in which all of the teachers time is spent in the classroom; teachers are provided with neither the time nor the environment for planning, thinking or undertaking any other activities which nurture professional growth. Ianni suggested that what we need instead is a situation allowing for part-time teaching, the rest of the teacher's time being devoted to non-teaching activities providing opportunity for professional growth outside the educational system.

Jencks commented on the incongruity between speaking on the one hand of increased professionalization, which he seemed to associate with increased specialization, and of encouraging teachers to engage in a range of activities outside the classroom.

Ianni, however, was not talking about increased specialization in its narrowest sense, but rather the type of professionalization represented by the conference participants themselves -- a professionalism that allows varied activities of many dimensions within a particular job. In this context teachers might undertake any variety of vocations or avocations during their non-teaching time on the job -- research, social work, government activity, etc. This suggests also that individuals who hold jobs outside the educational establishment might profitably be granted some released time for teaching so that there would be a two-way flow of individuals between the schools and institutions outside the educational establishment.

Thus, as Diamond commented, "any professional has to be more than a reduction to a particular function. It is one of the critical problems of all modern organization. It's a question of enriching one's experience in life generally in order to be a more effective person and also, therefore a more effective teacher both on the formal and informal level."

THE CULTURE OF POVERTY

Oscar Lewis

The Story of Catin

I speak God's truth. I am just a little girl, nine years old, and don't know much but I do know that I love Arturo, Grandma, Crucita and mami very much. Mami is good and gives me love. She says all the time, "I have my children. I am not alone. I don't abandon my children." That's why, when I grow up, I want to be a doctor or a chambermaid. So when I work and earn money, I'll put it in the bank and give mami the bank book so she can take out what she wants. Then I'll send for Arturo and Quique and I'll buy mami furniture and everything. This furniture we have is no good.

I'd like to be happy like other girls and have a papa so that when mami gets sick she can run and tell him. I love my mama and will never leave her alone. And neither will she leave me.

I am a good girl. I am clean, I sweep, I do everything, and I behave myself. I mind others, obey my teacher and all that. I don't ask my mama to buy me things. I say to mami in a nice way, "Mami, are you going to buy me that dress?" If she can't, then she doesn't buy it. The nuns say that's how you have to be good.

The boys say I am pretty, that I have pretty hair

but I think I am ugly. What I would like now is to get this leg of mine cured.

Benedicto said to me, "Don't you worry. One of these days we're going to take you to the hospital and have you fixed up." Mami says so, too. But I am afraid of the doctor and I don't want to miss school. So, what I do is go to church a lot so I'll be cured.

The things is, I am a coward. I'm afraid of the hospital. I'd rather stay home. I'm afraid they will stick a needle in me and open me with a knife. The only way they will ever be able to catch me and give me an injection is if they get me when I am asleep. They told me they were going to take X-rays and I got so nervous you could hear my teeth chattering. Toya came over right away and said, "Did they cut your leg?" I was afraid I was going to die and then they would pull out all my guts. That's what they do in the hospital. They cover you with a sheet and put you in a coffin and bury you. Nobody ever sees you again after you are buried.

I cry when mami gets an attack and goes to the hospital, because I have to stay with the children. That Toya doesn't obey me and begins pestering me. Mami tells her to do something and she doesn't do it. When she behaves badly I smack her in the face. Mami doesn't want me to hit her, but I do it so she won't be calling me nasty

names. I'm tired of taking care of the children and it makes me mad.

If my cousin Gabriel stays over it's even worse. If mami leaves a sausage, Gabi and Toya eat the whole thing. They eat all the bread, and when mami comes home I am the one who gets all the blame. That's why I smack Gabi in the face, too. That child is a big rascal. When I go to his house he doesn't want me to touch anything. Auntie Flora says to him, "Whatever is here is for everybody, not just for you."

That boy! One day I dreamed that Auntie died and Uncle wanted the things in the house for himself and he brought his girl friend Leila there. But I told Leila no, she couldn't have the tings. Then, right away Gabi came and said, "Flora told me that nobody was going to get those things."

And so I said to him, "Look, Gabi, you get out of here! Those things are not yours. Auntie told me way back to take care of them." That child is always butting in.

What I would like is to go back to Puerto Rico. I am going to tell mami that when school is over we should leave. They don't cure her here and the doctors are making her nervous. In Puerto Rico they will cure her. Then she could go back to work. She can't do that here because she

is in the hospital so much. She says that when I am a big girl and she is working, she is going to buy us real pretty clothes.

My own mother is bad. She has about a hundred children. She gives some away and the others she neglects. She dresses herself up real pretty but the children go around the house with shit in their pants.

They say that a man who lives with my mama was my papa and that he gave her a beating for mistreating me and so she threw me against the drainpipe and broke my leg. That's why mami asked her for me. Mami wanted me and asked her for my clothes and took me to a hospital. She says that she alone is my mama and Arturo is my papa.

I remember that we were living in the country with Arturo. Mami and Arturo used to fight there. He would hit her hard because she didn't listen to him. That was why we left and went to La Esmeralda. Arturo was paying for the room but one day mami began to fight with him and she picked up a knife and went after him. We took it away from her. Arturo left but he came back a few days later.

Then mami went to work in don Camacho's bar. She worked selling, collecting the money and serving the tables. She sold rum. She worked and paid the rent and Arturo took care of us. He would get up at one to go to the store and he brought us lunch. Then he would go for Quique

and let him play in the street. Mami continued in the life and she would leave us with Arturo.

I remember mami's dead husband, Tavio. He was very good to me. He gave me a very pretty dress. He was very strong, taller than mami, and he could jump the fence without hurting himself or anything. But one day he went out with his friend to get some things for mami . . . a lot of things all of gold . . . Then when he was coming out, they were waiting for him and they shot him. I think he used to go out to steal, because that's what Mami said.

That's when mami's attacks first began. She loved him very much, just like Arturo. The funeral was real pretty. We still have some pictures of the funeral.

Afterward don Camacho used to come to La Esmeralda, but I didn't know him well because he would be in the living room in Grandma's house. What I know is that don Camacho was an old man with a house and a wife. But he was real rich and had bars on every street.

Simplicio began to work for don Camacho, too, because he got married to Flora. I knew Flora when she lived with Fontanez. I used to go there, but Fontanez didn't like me because I would come to tell Flora that Uncle wanted to talk to her.

I remember once I saw Simplicio giving Alvaro's wife some beer and I went and told Grandma. Fernanda and

Flora went over there and started a big fight! Alvaro's wife hid because Auntie was going to kill her. Then Uncle took a bat and was going to beat me, but mami came and started to fight with him.

After that don Camacho paid the fares for all of us to go to New Jersey--Simplicio, too. We went to live with Felicita, who was the Edmundo then. Edmundo made a lot of faces over that. He always had a long face. Simplicio, Flora, Felicita and all the children were living there, except Felicita's twins, Angelito and Gabi, who stayed with Grandma in Puerto Rico.

One day in Fela's house I went through the bedroom and Fela was naked and so was Emundo. Fela began laughing and I said to her, "You shameless thing," and I went out. I told mami but she didn't say anything. And then Felicita made fun of mami. So we did it back at her and Quique said, "I have to defend her, she is our mama."

Mami took a room and we began living in that other house. It was a real big one and mami worked right there. She kept on working and began to live with Eddy. He was all right. But I hate all the husbands mami takes and I don't call them "papa" or anything. Once he started to fight with mami and she went and burned him

On my birthday they made a party. That was when mami went crazy. The day of my party there was such a fight that mami was screaming. She gets very nervous. She

was very pretty that day and they knocked her earrings off. There was a nice glass door there and they smashed it and everything else. Mami was biting the man, so he hit her and Cruz grabbed a knife. Mami got nervous and began screaming, "Get out of here or I'll kill you!" And she nearly did. Well, he left.

They took my mami to the hospital in a car and left her there. The thing is she can't stand it if she gets hit in the head very many times and she was in the crazy house for two months. They took everything away from her in the crazy house, her watch and all.

Eddy used to go to see her, and Crucita, too. We used to peek in and see her through the window. The window was all barred up, because she threw out everything they gave her.

We stayed with Crucita, who was good to us. At lunchtime she fried us eggs and gave us potatoes with sweet sauce; and for dinner she made soups and everything. Crucita wasn't working outside, as there was a man by the name of Jorge Luis who was in love with her and bought her everything.

Crucita wanted to go back to Puerto Rico and abandon us. She had her ticket and money. Then they got a ticket for mami, too, while she was in the hospital, and Crucita got tickets for us and we all went to Puerto Rico

When we were in the airplane, I said to Crucita, "Comb my mami nicely." Grandma was glad to see us. She was living with Hector when this happened. Grandma made a special vow and that was why mami got cured. So then mami began working for don Camacho again. He gave her money and mami rented a room.

Arturo used to take care of us. He is really nice and I love him and he loves me. I had a lovely photo of him, and Emilio, Crucita's husband, tore it up. He thought it was some sweetheart of Crucita's.

Then, I don't know, but when mami came here to New York she left me behind. She said she didn't have the fare for me but only for Sarita and Toya and I had to stay but that she would come for me later. Quique didn't go either because he didn't want to.

Well, so I stayed. In the daytime I was at Nanda's house. It was good there because Hector was nice to me He worked and bought the food and she would cook a great big potful for everybody. She would give some to Arturo and to Eufemia, the next-door neighbor. I ate a lot, but Grandma always gave me plenty. One day she took one of those short sticks and beat me with it because a neighbor had hit me and I had scratched her. I wasn't going to let her get away with it. I hit right back. So they came and told Grandma. I got sick with a fever. I would get asthma and I was always catching cold. That's why I am so skinny.

Fernanda didn't pay any attention to me at that time because she was in love with Junior. That is why I hate Junior. I don't like him; I love Hector. When Hector went to work, Fernanda would open the window and begin whistling. "Who are you whistling to?" I would say to her.

"Junior," she answered.

"What if Hector catches you?" I'd ask her.

On Thanksgiving, Hector bought Nanda a roast turkey, and he gave it to her and said, "For you, negra." And would you believe it, but that afternoon when he came back from work he found Junior and Fernanda kissing. So Junior left and I went to his house and said to him, "Why don't you go away?"

Crucita went and said to him, "Junior, why don't you go away? Can't you see she loves Hector more? Because when she's broke Hector gives her money."

I slept with Arturo and Quique. I didn't stay at Fernanda's because when she got drunk there was no living with her. She would put on pants and begin dancing and carrying on and Crucita pulling at her to try to make her stop. There was no living with her when she was like that.

Arturo lived alone. He says he doesn't marry because mami is his wife. He didn't dare bring many women around because of Quique and me. I would knock on the door real loud and say, "Arturo, let me in. It's nighttime."

When he didn't open, I would go looking for Quique and he would come back with me and say, "Papi, open up, it's me and Catin. It's raining." It wasn't really but he said it just so he would let me in. If he didn't open, Quique would climb over the house and go in through a window.

One time I had to throw that drunk Pucha out of there. I said to her, "You get out of this house. You don't live here and can't give orders." I got her out but she gave me a slap, a real hard one. Crucita heard and came right over. I was crying and she spoke real nasty to Pucha. Pucha is a fresh one and that is why Crucita insulted her and bawled her out.

Finally Nanda left Hector. It happened on a day when we were eating at Crucita's house. Arturo was very warm and Quique was sweating, so we moved to the bench outside to eat. Hector came and caught Nanda and Junior kissing and said, "What fine thing this is!" So right then and there Nanda pulled out a Gem she had, broke it into pieces and cut Hector. Arturo jumped in and held her to stop the fight. They were going to send Nanda to jail but Hector didn't want that. I kept quiet because there were a lot of people around.

Arturo left for the country and we went to live in Crucita's house. Bendito, but Crucita didn't have money She had so many things to pay for and the sick baby to take care of. The little house was so small.

Then Crucita lived with Alejandro. He was good. He bought Crucita a bed and I slept with her. When he came off the ship he would give everything to Crucita and tell her to go and pay the grocery bill and buy whatever she wanted. It was fine, except that Emilio still loved her and always kept spying on her. He came to Crucita's at night to fight. "Why do you open the door for him?" I asked her. "He threatens you with a gun but that's nothing to you. If I were you I wouldn't open the door."

Crucita is lame. They are going to send her to New York to see if she can't be cured, but she doesn't want to leave the children with anybody. I feel sorry for her and would like to see her again. She was really nice and would play with us and everything. I would call Angelito and Quique and tell them to get together a gang because Crucita was waiting to play with us. So we would go there and she would tell us all to line up to play hide-and-seek or whoever-touches-this-wins. I'd run and run and win.

Once a fight started because Quique called me cripple, even though he doesn't like it when they say that to Crucita. A kid was saying it to her and Quique punched him in the mouth. Angelito held the boy and Quique punched him. Crucita said, "If he calls me cripple again he better get away because my nephew will beat him up."

But Quique teased me by calling me "cripple." He likes cats and has a lot of them. So I told him that if he called me "cripple" again I would throw out his cats and he said, "O.K., I won't call you 'cripple' any more."

Crucita was the one who bought things for me. Mami sent Fernanda money but I never saw any of it. Fernanda wanted it for Junior. Crucita put me in school and I liked it very much. I was going into the second grade, and Felicita was still saying I didn't know how to write, that Gabi was the one who knew. But I was good in school. The teachers hit me only once. Crucita would fix up my clothes to go to school and so did my Grandma. Nanda would buy me my uniforms. Once she said to me, "Catin, go and pawn this chain for me. You have to go to school tomorrow and you have no shoes."

It was Saturday and Arturo had not come for me that day. Arturo came for me on Saturdays and brought me back on Sunday. When I was going to pawn the chain, Emilio went to Crucita's house to beat Grandma. Emilio owned a gun and he had traded it with Hector for a knife. "You're a no-good bum," Nanda said to Emilio and he hit her. I put down the money I got for the chain and went for Auntie. I knocked and knocked, and in a minute the police were there and they caught Emilio with that long knife he had. Arturo and nearly everybody came to see. Crucita did, too.

What happened was that Hector gave Emilio the knife to kill Junior. Hector didn't want to get into trouble, so he sent Emilio. And Emilio said, "All right, if I get into trouble, you will too. I know you're a good man, Hector! You treat my children good." So Emilio was

looking for Junior. But Junior went running home and Hector said, "I'll get even for this sliced-up face of mine. That's how she is, my negra!"

Look how nice Hector is. He told Nanda about the job at dona Ofelia's. Otherwise Nanda wouldn't have gotten it. Sometimes I used to go over there to help Nanda serve the tables, and wash the dishes and scrub. After Nanda served all the people and everything, we would shut the door tight and sit down to eat ourselves. Then we would clean off the tables and all that.

I can say that Crucita never beat me. But Fernanda did. When I got home from school, Crucita would send me to wash Chuito's diapers. I liked doing it. And she would fix my clothes for me and all so that I would be neat and clean. Crucita loves children, but just imagine, Emilio nearly took her little girl away from her!

Once there was a real big fight in Papo's place. What happened was that Gladys came to Cruz's house once and Alejandro fell in love with her, but Gladys is a coward and doesn't fight fair. Luckily, Fela and a friend mixed in and defended Cruz. You see, Gladys was carrying on with Alejandro.

"I knew Alejandro before you did," Crucita told her. "We knew him before anybody here. If you think you're going to get him, you better beat it right now."

The next day Auntie Fela went out on the street singing, and when she passed by on the side where Gladys' house is, they tried to hit her with a bottle. Auntie Fela

fought back, though. They took a punch at her but she ducked, and it hit a friend of Auntie Fela's, but he grabbed her and held her back. Then Crucita got in it and said, "Drop that bottle! I know my husband is in there. You can have him!"

And that is how life went along there.

Felicita spent all her time picking up men, and she would say to me, "Put the children to bed for me and I'll give you money." She didn't pay Crucita anything for taking care of the children at night and that was why Crucita got angry. Because she can't work much on account of being lame. She was always fighting with her sister because Fela neglected the children. Cruz spoke real rough to her. "Great whore, why don't you attend to your children," she would say. Taking care of those children of Felicita's was killing me. I was so skinny that I hardly had any strength to do anything. And I was so nervous I couldn't even pick up Chuito because I was afraid I would drop him. Then on e day when I was coming out of church with a lot of people around, Felicita got hold of me and slapped me. She always does things like that so people will talk about us.

Arturo and his son once wanted to take me to the country. Chirpa is Arturo's son and he has a little girl who looks like Sarita, and a very pretty wife. I said yes, yes, I wanted to go. Because there is a rowboat there that belongs to him and a long bridge. I ride in the boat and

jump in the river. Arturo made a little playhouse for us and we used to climb up on top of it. At this house he would be having us ride horseback or be bathing us in the river or playing with us. He is very good. I would like mami and Arturo to get together again, but she doesn't want to because, she said, he is black.

So that is how things were when I was sleeping one day in Crucita's house. At about one in the morning there was a knock on the door and it was mami. She hugged me right away. I didn't see Sarita but I heard her talking English: "Mami, come over here." and "Mami, your friend." Mami didn't know any English, though.

Mami stayed at Crucita's house. She went to visit Hector and when she saw his cut-up face, she got furious. "How did that happen?" she wanted to know.

"Your mama, But that's nothing, she's my negra," he told her. Then Leonor, the wife he has now, came out and gave him a shove. So Hector kicked her and she hit Gabi. Mami said to her, "Leonor, if you beat that child, you are going to get into trouble, because he is my nephew. If you touch him, you are going to have to settle with me"

The next day mami asked me what Cruz said about her. "Nothing," I told her. "Cruz said you got attacks of hot pants."

"Oh, that's nothing. Don't pay any attention."

I told mami I wanted to go back with her, that I was tired of Puerto Rico and didn't want to live there.

I said I was dying because Grandma hit me all the time, and I couldn't hold out much longer. Mami told me it was a good thing she came to see me. So than I told Cruz and she said, "Don't go. You're in school. Soledad will come again next year and you can leave with her then."

I said to her, "No, I'm leaving. I have to learn English. I must learn!"

"Write me,"Crucita said. I would but I don't know her address.

The trip was all a blank. I got airsick. When I came to, they were saying, "Fasten your seat belts. We are about to land." I asked mami where we were going, but she didn't say anything.

When we came out Benedicto was there, but I didn't recognize him. I kept looking him over because Toya called him papi.

"Toya, don't be calling him papi. That's not your papa," I told her. Toya's real papa is Tavio.

"Yes, he is my papa," she said.

When we got to the house I asked mami, "Mami, who is he?"

"That's my husband," she said.

"Husband? Oh. I'm going out, mami. I can't take that." I told her. So I went outside and ate a piece of cake.

I cried all the time when I first came to New York. It was the beginning of the cold weather and I didn't like it. I missed Arturo and kept calling for him.

At night I couldn't sleep. I missed Chito, too.

Benedicto never did anything to me. But it's that I hate all the husbands mami ever had. And he beats mami. He stays out all night and they fight over that a lot. Mami gets furious and beats him. One time he was going to punch mami, and she ducked and he hit his fist on a drawer. Then he said to her, "Ay, Soledad, fix up my hand for me."

"Drop dead! she told him.

I loved that. Mami had got the better of him. I hate Benedicto because he says that if I keep on hanging out in the street he is going to send me back to Puerto Rico. That is why, when he is around, I lock myself in the bathroom and don't come out. The thing is, he beats mami and drives her crazy. He punches her so hard he knocks her against the wall.

I keep saying to mami, "Let's go to Puerto Rico to Arturo. Leave Benedicto, because one of these days he's going to hit you and kill you." But she doesn't listen to me. So let her stay with him!

When I am big, I am going to say to Benedicto, "How much money do you want to leave my mami?" Then I'll send for Arturo and Quique. If Arturo is around when Benedicto tries to take advantage of mami or if he grabs us and smashes us against the floor, he won't get away with it.

I don't know why, but once there was trouble and mami sent me over to Uncle Simplicio's house. I slept on the caucho there and Flora took me to Delancey Street. I put on shorts and washed the bathroom and scrubbed and washed dishes for her. Then, when Flora began to work, I came back home. But now, since Gabriel is there, they don't want me. I say to him, "Uncle, can I go for the weekend?" But he won't let me. When Gabriel isn't here, though, he does want me. That's the thing. Now when he wants to take me home, I tell him I won't go with him. "You want Gabriel?" I say to him. "Then stick with your Gabriel."

I beat Gabriel because he hits me. If he hits me, I am not just going to take it. He is a very nice-looking boy and thinks he is Superman. The only difference is, everybody loves Superman and I hate Gabriel. Uncle is always buying him a coat and everything, and telling me what a good boy he is. He never stops taking about it. He took him to Pennsylvania twice already but he wouldn't take me. It doesn't matter though, because mami is going to take me any day now.

Uncle is no saint. He doesn't gamble because he knows they might arrest him. He drinks, though, and has girls. He is in love with the little girl from across the street. "Let's you and me kiss," he says to her. "Catin, cover your eyes. Cover your eyes." And he goes chasing her around the table. I know he tries to make love to that little girl. Then she gets mad and says, "If papa

297

knew you were trying to kiss me . . . I am going to tell my papa." Simplicio is no saint, even though he tries to make people think he is.

I don't like to play with anybody, just mani. We jump rope, but mami comes home late from work. I don't have many girl friends. Those friends of min just give a person trouble.

One day they said that mami is a whore. I answered right back, "Isn't your mama one, too? She picks up men and takes money from them."

Right away, Aida says to me, "No, she never does that."

"Oh, no, never!" I said to her. "Wait till she sends you outside with the baby so she can get the money from the men. But don't worry, I'm going to tell mami now."

So I went and told her, "Mami, Aida says you're a whore and pick up men." Mami went to Aida's mama and said to her, "Say, tell Aida I'm not a whore." Then she went and locked herself in the house and right away she got an attack. She can't have bad things happen to her because she gets that way and can't speak or breathe. She throws herself on the floor and bites her tongue. She wants to bite it off.

They say that mami goes to men's houses but mami says, "Nobody can say anything about me because I do it so my children can eat."

B98

I feel sorry for mami. I wish she wasn't in trouble with anybody. Let her not talk to Rosalia because that old woman has a longer tongue than I. Rosalia is the one to blame for everything that happens because she introduces men to my mami and then gets her into trouble. I think she told Benedicto that mami was in love with Elfredo.

One day I went looking for mami and they told me, "Your mama is at Elfredo's house."

I acted innocent and said, "Who is Elfredo? I don't know him." I was afraid on account of Benedicto because they fell in love in his house behind his back. Elfredo says he doesn't beat women and I like men like that. Elfredo brought us records and played them. Benedicto came and saw them so I took and gave them back to Elfredo. "Here, Elfredo," I said, "take them so mami won't have trouble."

Right now we have to take advantage because Benedicto has a lot of money. He came back from the ship with it. I am going to tell mami to ask him to get the television out of the punchoff so that when I come home from school I can sit on the couch and take a rest watching television.

Yesterday I told mami that Benedicto was talking English to Rosalia. They just said a few words but I went and told mami because she gets mad when he speaks English. My mama hates English. So she said, "Listen, go tell Benedicto to come here."

399

When Benedicto came he said about me, "That child should have her tongue cut off. One of these days she's going to get us all put in jail."

Elfredo and mami kept seeing each other, but mami wanted him to give her money and buy her things whether he wanted to or not. He would say to her, "Wait a moment! Take it easy, daughter, I haven't collected yet."

One time mami slapped Elfredo because she saw him with a woman. Then she got very nervous and had an attack. Elfredo stopped coming around to the house and I said, "Elfredo got married." Mami told me he was not married and to stop coming around with gossip.

The thing is that Elfredo knew that mami was in love with the Colombian and I think Benedicto did, too. It's Rosalia's fault because she told mami that this Colombian was nice and so he gave mami the eye and invited us to the movies.

I gave mami a dirty look and later I said to her, "Mami, is that man going to the movies with me? I won't go. You know I don't like Colombians."

When mami is in love she acts different. She stays out in the street. I think she is going to stop going with men because she has these attacks. If she is going to have bad times with men, she better leave them. Oh, my Lord! I want her to leave them.

Imagine, that Colombian left mami in the lurch. Every few minutes mami would tell me to go see if he was coming. And I would answer, "Oh, mami! I'm not your servant. I'm not going to be on the lookout for him. I wish all Colombians would drop dead." So she grabbed me and hit me. She gave me two slaps in the face in front of Uncle.

Mami was even going to poison herself on accont of him. She was lying back on the couch when she called me and said, "Catin, bring me a glass of water. I am going to take these pills to poison myself."

I gave her the water and ran out yelling and crying. When I came back she didn't open her eyes any more or answer, or anything. They called the ambulance and took her away. We stayed with the lady next door but they brought mami back right away and she was well.

I am afraid that if Benedicto comes back there is going to be trouble here. Rosalia might tell him about mami and the Colombian. The thing is that they lie down in mami's bed and we get into the bed in the other room. I have seen them kissing. Yes, that's the truth. If Benedicto goes after mami and hits her, I am not going to talk to any of them again.

What I would like to see is Uncle beat up Benedicto. If the police came he could say, "This man

began beating my sister and I just defended her." And he could bring mami as a witness and nothing would happen.

Mami put me in school now, and it's better there. I can learn English. I love to talk English. After I know how, I can talk in English and she won't know what I am saying.

I have been here for a long time already and so I am forgetting Spanish. English is what comes into my head. In school, I want to say "Ven aca" and what comes out is "Come on." Mami says that if I learn to talk English she'll beat me. But I tell her I would love to learn English. I start talking to Sarita and mami says to me, "Listen, you shut that mouth. You are not going to talk English around here." She gets very mad.

So I tell her, "But, mami, I have to learn to talk English, because if I don't I'll get left back in school."

Mami says, "I hate the Americans but not the ones who speak Spanish."

Mami didn't want to buy me a notebook I needed for school. I began to cry but then I stopped. She just left and didn't even listen to me. That's why they gave me F. And at home the kids throw my things around and I can't find anything. Now I can't find my pencil case.

The schools are better here. They mistreat you in the schools in Puerto Rico. Mrs. Guerra, my teacher in

Puerto Rico, was a bully and made me kneel down and all. If you come late here they leave you alone, but in Puerto Rico you have to go to the stupid principal. They grab the children by the hair there and they don't let you play. They tell you to go to the bathroom and come right back. Not here. Here they let you play a lot and the lunches are better. They give fresh milk and all kinds of fruit. That's why I like school better here.

But the children here are worse than the ones in Puerto Rico. They bully me. They muss my hair and one girl scratched me and Sarita and didn't let us eat. But that doesn't matter. If that girl hits me I hit her back. I have two good hands and I can hit back. But believe me, I used to be afraid. When I got home I told my mother and she said not to be such a dummy . . . that whoevever hit me, I should hit back. Since that time I don't let anybody hit me any more.

When I grow up I am going to get even with all of them. I want to go back to Puerto Rico, but only after I know English so as not to talk Spanish to anybody. Not even to mami. I will talk to her in English. I'll call her "Mother." As I won't know much Spanish, I will take somebody with me and I will pay their fare just for them to speak Spanish for me. And so, I'll tell this friend of mine who speaks Spanish, "Tell my grandma to leave Junior

because Junior won't do her any good."

Then I'll go to Hector's and I'll tell him, "Don't worry, Hector." Hector knows English. He is a merchant marine and the merchant marine know a lot of English. So I will be able to talk to Hector and he will understand. I will say to him, "Don't worry, Hector. One of these days, Grandma is going to leave Junior and go back to you. Mami is coming over here to fix it up."

I am going to tell Junior's mama, too, "Now look, dona Celestina, tell your son to go look for somebody else. and that Nanda is not young. So let Junior leave her, because I can't keep on spending money to be coming here." Maybe Celestina will tell him, because she used to hate Nanda.

Oh, how Grandma will cry when I get hold of her and say, "When we were little, you didn't want to take care of us. Now you can't be with Simplicio because he is with me in New York."

And if Simplicio is there, I'll say to him, "Listen, Simplicio, tell your mama to forget about me. I didn't come to see her. I just came to see Crucita."

And then I'll go to Crucita's and I'll say, Crucita, do you remember how it used to be, Sure you remember. You don't know English, Crucita, but come to New York and I will help you take care of the children.

You'll live with mami. You know, I'll give you a room for yourself and for Anita and Chuito."

Benedicto has to fix up this house and not keep it like a dump. We have money in the bank. This is a good house. When mami fixes it up it is as pretty as it can be. The bad thing is that the neighbors don't let you sleep and those children turn the place upside down. That Toya has her bed all rotted out with pee and that makes mami mad.

Oh, my Lord! If only mami wouldn't get any more of those attacks. She gets the attacks more on account of Benedicto than anything else. It's because he wants to use her like she was a servant. "Soledad, put my shoes on for me. Soledad, my shirt. Soledad, go buy me this." He orders her and orders her and mami can't walk much. And how they fight! One day mami was going out and Benedicto had to go somewhere too. So mami told him, "I'll be back when you are, because I'm not going to be shut in the house here by myself."

So he said to her, "Who gives the orders? You or me?"

"Me," mami said to him, "because you are not my husband any more."

So he grabbed her and punched her and mami pulled a knife and was going to stick him with it but he held her

off. Mami nearly killed me because he grabbed me and shoved me in between the two of them. He tried to cover himself with Sarita, too. He hates us both. Mami would have killed him if he hadn't covered himself with us. Then Benedicto tried to get the knife away from her and tried to bend her hand until finally the knife stuck in his finger. "I cut my own self," he said.

I called him a liar and Toya called him a fairy, a son of a whore, and all kinds of bad things. I felt like taking that cover off the knife and sticking it through his head. It is a strong thing and if you stick it into somebody he dies. I wanted to stick it into him, but I got into bed all nervous and shaking.

This is the last time he is going to hit her, because if he does it again, I am going to stick a knife into him so he can't take advantage of mami any more. Men are bad, all of them. There isn't a single good one. That's why, when I grow up, I am not going to get married. I am going to be a nun. That way you can be alone and work and earn a lot of money.

Nearly every week we go to the Pee House. That's what they call the movie theatre, because everybody pees on the floor. It's down Eagle Avenue and it's cheap. All it costs is a quarter. We go in at one o'clock and don't get back sometimes until ten when the pictures are good.

Oh, how I like going to the movies with mami! Because mami likes the funny pictures and enjoys herself. She laughs the most at Cuquita. He is a man who dressed up like a woman. He puts on a dress and a wig and ribbons and he looks like a fat woman and he dances real nice.

I like the one we saw about Zorro. It was real good. Antonio Aguilar was in it and Antonio Aguilar's brother. He played Zorro. He had daughters and when they grew up they could ride horses and everything. So they grabbed the bad men, the rich ones, and took their money and gave it to the good ones, you know, the poor people . . . the ones who send their children to school dirty and all that. I feel sorry for them. Then after that the father Zorro, got old and they shot him with an arrow, but the daughters saved him.

When I grow up I would like to be one of the Zorras so when I go back to Puerto Rico I can put on the Zorro clothes and get a horse and begin helping the poor people and kill the rich ones. They have to get what's coming to them, and I will kill the crooks too.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION AFTER OSCAR LEWIS PAPER

The discussion centered largely around three topics: the Puerto Rican cultural background, anxieties and fears rising out of that background, and the problems of Puerto Rican children in school.

In general, Oscar Lewis pointed out, Puerto Ricans have far more physical mobility than Negro slum dwellers; while the latter are frequently locked into their own little world of the ghetto, Puerto Ricans tend to travel between the island and the mainland a great deal. Some 3½ million Puerto Ricans make a million such trips every year. Lewis tended to think they were thus "escaping their problems," though there was a sharp rebuttal that New York slums are as much of a sewer as Puerto Rico's, hence provide no escape.

Lewis was struck by the differences between Mexican and Puerto Rican slum dwellers. The former had far more sense of identity; perhaps because they had as a people, fought for their independence. Historically, Indian civilization in Mexico resisted conquest to a degree unknown in Puerto Rico. Over a 300 year period, some 300,000 Spaniards had been absorbed, creating a specifically new Mexican culture. Puerto Ricans, on the other hand, had remained a colony of Spain for 400 years and, in 1898, when the US took over, had just about reached commonwealth status. Thereafter, they were once again, subject to naked

colonization, this time by an English-speaking culture. The amount of cultural disintegration, furthermore, could be gauged by the relative disinterest Puerto Ricans have in their African origins - unlike Cuba, where African culture has been a subject of intense interest.

No one, of course, could deny the material progress of Puerto Rico made in the last 20-25 years, but one should remember that this progress was unevenly distributed.

The effect of this history was to create a deeply alienated people, a people with little pride in themselves.

Oscar Lewis' material, it was felt, illustrated the basic fears, hates and deprivations of Puerto Rican slum children. Certainly the deepest fear in the nine-year old girl was that of death and illness. Recurrent themes also were: violence, lack of constancy in marriage and sexuality, and the fear of being abandoned. Curiously enough, references to food were few. But all in all, the humanity of these kids pierced through the terror and violence of their lives. Paul Goodman wondered whether the large number of adult figures which entered into Catin's life (as contrasted with the usual pair important to a middle class child) did not intensify this comparative sense of what is human. A slum child, he noted, can also be expected to see through certain kinds of frauds teachers try to put over on him, probably because of the "honesty"

of his harsh background. The same background, on the other hand, had institutionalized the child's family role into that of a nurse for smaller children. These conditions not only prevented kids from doing things like homework, but also, in some cases, prevented a child from even knowing how to play.

The constant search for security in Catin and other slum children, which was both a personal and class-wide neurosis, drove her to school. It was important to note that she felt that learning English provided some distance from her home. Other positive reinforcements motivating her to attend school were the relative kindness of the teachers and the school lunches.

On the relationship of teachers to slum kinds, Goodman noted that teachers had frequently come out of slum backgrounds themselves, though perhaps several generations back. As a result, they feared the kids and sought to defend themselves from them by dressing well, polishing their nails and so on. Furthermore, their fear of the kids drove them to be more punitive than they would be with middle class kids. ("We must have discipline"). There was no way of improving this tendency other than talking to teachers, one by one, and explaining the root of their behavior. The children, on the other hand, could be helped by making it possible for them to interact, not necessarily in a formal learning situation, with "warm"

adults. In such a setting, they might also come to discover that they were not unique in their suffering, that many other kids were going through the same thing. This discovery might tone down their anxieties.

No, someone said, the main thrust of the educational experience in school should <u>not</u> be to teach kids about slums. That was precisely why Catin wanted to go to school - to get away from home.

The point was refined not whether slum nor middle class children understand the uniqueness of their cultures, hence they must be taught the salient characteristics.

SCIENCE OF TEACHING

Paul Goodman

In a sense there cannot be teaching at all, since learning must start from the learner's intrinisic interest and need, which provides the energy for the Gestalt of what is learned and assimilated as second-nature. Because of this, Carl Rogers denies that there can be teachers at all, though people do learn.

Attempts at teaching -- either to provide "motivation" or to provide experience not meeting intrinsic need -- can be positively harmful. Children learn to speak excellently where no formal attempt is made to teach, but parents and peers provide a milieu of code that is picked up because of the child's need. On the other hand, teaching reading in many cases seems to prevent learning reading, and in the majority of cases it results in superficial reading-skill and wooden writing. Likely most normal children, in not-underprivileged urban milieu, would pick up the reading-and-writing code anyway by age 9 or 10, without formal teaching.

To learning, the child brings: exploring, questions, aping, taking part, coping, sociability.

"Teachers" can meet the child by answering questions, making environment fairly safe and copable,

making it authentic and relevant to child life, providing good personal models, and also being sociable.

There is no need at all for a pre-set "curriculum" in the elementary years (to age 12); trying to meet the child's developing interests is sufficient. The important task is not to motivate but to avoid discouraging the child's intrinsic motivations.

Types of "Teaching"

1. Training -- processing -- instruction (in the sense of Skinner's operant conditioning):

This is a process of excluding all alternative motion or motive (by isolation of punishment) that does not lead to the programmer's goal. Suffering inevitable defeat in his own desires, the subject identifies with the experimenter and temporarily takes on his motions.

Such conditioning is labile, and is lost at any negative re-enforcement. (So K. Goldstein). Contrast with second-nature learning, e.g. riding a bicyle, which is never lost

Most successful examination-passing is to be interpreted as follows: the real-life situation of the student is the need to pass; what is "learned" is a means to this end, and is forgotten as soon as the need vanishes.

(a) Sometimes incidental learning occurs during the training, when the program happens to touch on

an intrinsic need. My hunch is that very many people who have really learned to read and write did so by being processed in the code during the first grades, and then really learning to read with their own books at their own pace and according to their own interest.

(b) Processing can also look like learning when it meets the intrinsic need to don the social uniform and be like the others.

2. The most natural kind of learning is objective interest in a real enterprise. The "teacher" in this case is really providing an apprenticeship.

In my opinion, at the secondary level (high school) the best method of "teaching" cultural subjects would be to provide many small real enterprises, like TV and radio stations, scientific labos, design offices, local newspapers, little theaters, etc., where adolescents would serve apprenticeships according to their choice, with option to change from one to another.

In this kind of learning, energy is provided by the desired worth of the product and by the animation of cooperation. The primitive integrated community as an example.

3. Teaching of professions is a further stage of the same master-apprentice method. Here the teacher must make a special effort to help the young apprentice,

for the subject-matter is too complicated simply to be picked up in the course of carrying on the enterprise.

Why does the professional make the effort? Noblesse oblige, erotic attachment to the young, and wish to have his own professional identity continued in the profession. As Veblen said, contact with the young in this sense keeps the professional undesiccated and relevant to new problems.

Mother cooking and helping the small child make a small pie, A humanist explaining his appreciation of a poem. NEED EXAMPLES.

4. Guru as teacher. The guru (e.g. Frank Lloyd Wright) confronts the young with his own reality, concerns, prejudices, as fact. He is a source of power in the environment. The student's enery of learning in this confrontation is the fascination of the real, and his own confusion needing integration.

The guru seems to put up with the student either for erotic reasons or out of hostility to anything different from himself, that is, he needs to proselytize.

(a) A milder form of the same method of teaching-learning is teacher as Model, where the student grows by temporary identification, and the teacher has the satisfaction of showing off.

A good deal of good teaching is just providing entertainment.

5. Different from the Guru is the negative-reality provided by the maieutic (Socratic midwife) method, or psychotherapy. Here the therapist-teacher maintains his own reality like the guru but severely limits his power to his own ego-boundary, and the student or patient is strengthened in his own integration.

The energy of the teacher in this situation seems to come from a need to have allies in the political, cultural, or moral Republic. He wants a world of plural free centers in which open exploration can occur, so that he too can transcend himself.

The (Socratic) means is often shaming, whereby the student expresses himself freely, finds his expression is not acceptable in the universal Republic, but his potential self is respected, so that he is encouraged to integrate himself.

6. The Saint or Nurse finds fulfillment precisely in the creative growth of the other. This is a kind of agape, or perhaps the love of growing things that a gardener has.

Teaching as service; Sylvia Ashton-Warner is a good model of this kind. Progressive education in general is on this theory: it puts things in the child's way

that the child is (guessed to be) reaching toward.

(a) Good academic teaching is a species of this serviceable kind: the teacher is really living, and fulfilling himself, in memory, in repeating the great moments (e.g. St. John's of Annapolis). He is a servant of history and civilization.

(No doubt, also, much of the energy for the psychotherapist in maieutic teaching is to use the process as a bridge to his own past; so Socrates is trying to "remember" the courts of Jove.)

(b) Second-rate academic teaching is a perverted version of this type. There are several bad variants:

(1) Trying to impose on the student a theorized schedule of development. (So Martin Deutsch's head-start theory, with its revival of "transfer of training". So often Piaget.)

This soon becomes operant-conditioning: an abstract school-environment is imposed on the young in which they cannot cope intrinsically, and must meet the extrinsic schedule. Typically: it is believed that children first learn monosyllables like "cat" and "rat"; but indeed Tyrannosaurus Rex is to a child just as much a word as any monosyllable.

(2) A bad variant at the level of higher education is the notion of the "well rounded academic

syllabus" with its required subjects; rather than relying on the acquisition of well-rounded learning by the branching out of intrinsic interest.

DISCUSSION FOLLOWING GOODMAN PRESENTATION

Goodman's thesis stirred a good deal of animated and not always connected discussion. His characterization of Piaget's stages, for example, was immediately attacked on the grounds that Piaget had written the book some 30 years ago and had since then clarified some of the issues raised; and furthermore, that the book dealt with the first two years of an infant's life, described the learning process and not the educational one. Goodman, admitted that children did pass through stages, notably sexual stages. But that to construct rigid learning techniques corresponding to learning stages simply did not make sense, for it might well inhibit children from developing at their own speed and in their own natural way.

The question of what is "natural" to a child was to run through the balance of the discussion. When, someone asked, do the natural cognitive process of children become contaminated or imposed on by adult culture? As soon as parents and children begin to interact, someone later answered - sometimes at the very breat, when the sucking child is removed "because it is time." More generally, both Goodman and Diamond pointed out adults impose connotative meanings on children who tend to think only in concrete terms.

This was all very well and true, but when institutionally did the process of inhibiting "natural" growth start to take place? What were its concrete manifestations?

As no clear answer was forthcoming, someone else pointed out even before social institutions had their chance to impose themselves on a child, a simple power struggle might have taken place between child and parents; the child, in fact, might have provoked his parents into asserting their capacity for domination.

Participants engaged in a good deal of good-natured grumbling at this, noting that in contemporary American culture, the parents were frequently the losers in this contest between themselves and the child, while in many other cultures, parents usually assumed the upper hand, thus permitting the orderly transfer of dominant cultural characteristics.

Goodman objected to any analysis using concepts such as domination and submission. Children adapt themselves to a given environment without necessarily being forced to. Mothers must, in a sense, act the role of the Professional-who-Teaches-Out-Of-Noblesse-Oblige. We must also mold our environment to minimize the occasions on which a child must be disciplined in an authoritarian manner. Chidlren, Goodman, said are naturally cautious,

hence can be trusted far more often than is usually realized.

The trouble with viewing mothers as professionals - who - teach, etc., was that many mothers were clearly not anxious to fill this role; they preferred to send children to school as soon as possible to get them out of the way.

Goodman and Diamond pointed to this cultural trait as being an element inhibiting learning, one concrete manifestation of the crisis in mass education.

Diamond closed the discussion by remarking that participants had, to some extent, been talking at cross-purposes; those referring to the possibilities of continuing traditional modes of behavior without invoking authoritarian principles had experience of the passing on of knowledge in non-western cultures. But in the United States, a modern industrial culture, including mass production, fragmented bureaucracies and so on, further elaboration of that tradition implied authoritarian means.